





T —  
PER BR 1 .P625 v.2

The Princeton theological  
review



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/princetontheolog2319arms>



# THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 3—July, 1904.

## I.

### THOMAS CROMWELL.\*

(Conclusion.)

THE Bull of deprivation, long threatened against Henry, was now (August 30, 1535) prepared but not issued. It forbade his subjects to obey the King or his officials or magistrates. It absolved all Princes from every oath to him and commanded them to break every treaty with him. All Princes were commanded to rise in arms against him and all who obeyed him; all Christians were to seize wherever found the money, ships, credits and goods of any one who acknowledged his authority. And by the fullness of power given to the Pope, these became the absolute property of whoever seized them. All who refused to enforce this sentence became subject to the same penalties. Every clergyman in the world was to proclaim this curse before the largest possible concourse, and a lighted candle was to be cast down and extinguished, even as the souls of Henry and his supporters were condemned to hell.† But the publication of the Bull was suspended.

Such a sentence would readily suggest to Cromwell, even if there were no other motive in his mind, that the defense of his policy required the suppression of the monasteries. This act earned Cromwell's familiar name, "The Hammer of the Monks," and the worst traits of his character, traits common to most men of the day, show so plainly in the transaction that the solid reasons for it which appealed to a man of his type have been obscured. The monastic orders were corrupt. Cromwell sent commissioners to investigate the condition of the monasteries. Their sweeping denunciations

\* *Vide No. 2, April, 1904.*

† Wilkins' *Concilia*, III, 792

were based on hasty investigation and probably exaggerated for a purpose. The so-called "Black Book" which presented to Parliament the reports of the investigators of the condition of the monasteries has perished. It is safe to conclude, however, that it was not drawn up in a judicial frame of mind. But there are unquestionable judgments on the general corruption of the monastic orders of the day.

Gasparo Contarini, afterward Cardinal, writing in 1516 on "The Duties of a Bishop," said: "Unfortunately in some of the chief and celebrated cities most cloisters have become almost lupa-naria."\*

Bembo, Papal Secretary to Leo X, afterward Cardinal, wrote: "I have often found, under the affairs of friars, all human wickednesses covered with diabolical hypocrisy."† In 1536 the Pope appointed a commission of the ablest and best men around him to draw up a report on the reform of the Church. There is no language in any of the English reports or discussions stronger than that in which they denounce the condition of the monastic orders.

"Another abuse to be corrected is in the religious orders, because many have departed from God to such an extent that they are a scandal to secular Christians and do much harm by their example. We think all the conventional orders ought to be abolished; not, however, in such a way as to do injury to any one, but by prohibiting them from admitting novices. For thus, without any wrong, they might be swiftly swept out of existence and good religious could be substituted for them. But for the present we think it would be best if all boys who have not taken vows of any sort should be kept out of their monasteries."‡ This report was, quite properly, intended to be private, but the Protestant apologetes, having by some means procured a copy, its publication was forced. It was forwarded to Cranmer from Louvain, with the report that the monks of that place "fear their houses will perish. They have faith in the Provincial of the Carthusians who lately came from Italy, prophesying all rules of religion to be annulled."§ Cranmer forwarded this letter to the Government, probably to Cromwell, adding, "The book he sent me was *Concilium electorum Cardinalium de emendanda ecclesia*," and copies out the passage quoted above.¶

\* *Opera Parisiis*, 1571, page 426.

† *Letters*, 1520, *Opere Venezia*, 1729, I, III, page 385.

‡ *Concilium electorum Cardinalium de emendanda ecclesia*, British Museum.

§ *Letters and Papers*, VIII, 739. This letter is assigned to the wrong date, 1535. The *Concilium* was first published in 1538. The letter also alludes to an answer in preparation to the King's *Epistle to the Emperor*. The Epistle appeared in 1538.

There is reason to believe that the monasteries of England were not as bad as those in some other parts of the world. There are satires and attacks on them in English popular literature, but they are less numerous and bitter than in Germany or Italy. During the destruction of the English monasteries there were no outbreaks of popular hatred against them, while several counties rose in arms to defend them. On the other hand, the insurgent German peasants, in 1525, though they killed no monks, destroyed monastic buildings with a careful fury that indicates hatred coming out of a long smouldering sense of wrong. But though the English monasteries were probably neither as corrupt as monasteries in other parts of the world nor as bad as they were reported to be by their enemies, it would be possible to collect out of the remnant material from which the Black Book was prepared a formidable body of definite evidence to show that in many of them the ideal of their own order did not control the lives of the inmates. The Jesuit apologete Sanders wrote, in 1575, of "the publication of the enormities of the monasteries, partly discovered and partly invented."\* This judgment by an orthodox churchman of the next generation after their fall agrees with the testimony which survives and is probably fair.

Whatever the degree of their guilt may have been they menaced the State. There were in England more than seven hundred monastic establishments and they owned enormous estates. Ninety monasteries of Gloucestershire had an average of sixty-five thousand acres apiece. Twenty-seven abbots had seats in Parliament. The bishops could not control the monks, whose vows bound them to allegiance to their superiors, generally foreigners. They were directly connected with the Papacy, and the monastic orders came to be spoken of as the Pope's standing army. Cromwell was afraid of them. The schismatic Governments of Europe--the Lutheran States, the Scandinavian kingdoms and the Zwinglian Cantons of Switzerland--suppressed the monasteries in the sixteenth century. Most of the Roman Catholic countries limited the power and wealth of the monasteries under different conditions in the nineteenth--Portugal, 1834-64; Spain, 1835-51; Italy, 1866; Prussia, 1875; France, 1880. The United States is a country whose Constitution and practice exclude any suspicion of religious intolerance, but her Commission in the Philippines reported that the landed possessions of the monastic orders and their power among the people was an

\* Sanders' *Anglican Schism*, Ed. David Lewis, page 130.

obstacle to good government. And steps have been taken to destroy their political power by buying their great estates. There must be some reasons, plausible to say the least, for so universal an action.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century monastic institutions seemed to many people an anachronism in the modern world coming into being. The ascetic ideal was outworn. Cromwell, as a man of the Renascence, shared that repulsion of the Humanist for the monk which appears in Renascence literature from the *Decameron* to the *Utopia*, and led the Jesuits, who used the new learning in the service of the Church, to abandon the ascetic ideal. The loss of its power over men's minds went far deeper than appears in controversy. In the twelfth century four hundred and eighteen monasteries were founded in England. In the thirteenth, one hundred and thirty-nine. In the fourteenth century only twenty-three. In the fifteenth century only three.\* The monks were no longer the conservators of learning, but the strongest defenders of Scholasticism against the Humanist revival of letters. On the Continent they were the bitterest opponents of Reuchlin and Erasmus. Nor were they more intellectually progressive in England. Pole says that Reynolds was the "only monk in England who knew the three languages (Latin, Greek, Hebrew) in which all liberal learning is contained."† Beyond all this, in the opinion of many men, the monks did too little and got too much. A contemporary writer expresses their feeling roughly when he writes of the "nourishing of a great sort of idle abbey lubbers, which are apt to nothing only to eat and drink."‡ Sir Thomas More, in his critical youth, wrote of "those holy men, the abbots, who, not thinking it enough that they living at their ease do no good to the public, resolve to do it harm instead of good"§ (by turning tillage fields into pasture). And Sir Richard Gresham, Lord Mayor of London, gave the criticism practical form when he asked the King to put three hospitals in the city under the rule of the Mayor and Aldermen, because they "had been founded and endowed for the aid of poor and impotent people, not to maintain canons, priests and monks to live in pleasure."

Early in 1536 an Act of Parliament gave to the King the property of all religious houses having a yearly income below £200 (equivalent to \$10,000-\$12,000), because "of the vicious, carnal and

\* Pearson, *Hist. Atlas*, page 61.

† *Letters and Papers*, X, page 405.

‡ *Dialogue between Pole and Lupset*.

§ *Utopia*.

abominable living of small monasteries." Their superiors, if they did not try to embezzle the jewels of the houses, were to be pensioned. The monks might be assigned to the greater monasteries, "wherein, thanks be to God, religion is right well kept and observed." Any monk who wished to return to the world was to receive eight gold pieces.

But this last change in the ancient order caused the cup of wrath against Henry to overflow. That there was discontent in England and danger to the throne is sufficiently shown by the legislation passed to defend it and the nine executions under it. Observers differed as to the extent of that discontent. The Spanish Ambassador, who spoke no English and heard only what the opposition faction of the nobility told him, thought the great majority of the people were against the King and only waiting to welcome the Emperor when he should come to punish his rebellion from the Pope. This judgment, as far as we can judge from what happened fifteen years later when the marriage of Mary to the Emperor's son almost cost her the crown, was very much mistaken. The opposition faction of the nobility were, it is true, engaged in forming a conspiracy against the throne. They had long been begging the Spanish Ambassador to persuade Charles V to invade England, and promising to support him in arms if he came. As early as the end of 1534 Lords Hussey and Darcy offered, if Imperial troops were sent to the North and the mouth of the Thames, to rise under the Imperial banner with a crucifix attached. They promised the support of large numbers of noblemen and gentlemen of the North. From several quarters advice came to the Emperor to centre this discontent of the nobles around Reginald Pole, an heir to the Yorkist claim to the throne and intimately connected with three families in the Southwest who had great wealth and influence. "In two counties alone they might easily raise twenty thousand men under arms, the best soldiers England can boast of." The Ambassador told him that many people thought Pole's title better than Henry's,\* and said his brother Geoffrey continually urged that if Reginald came with an Imperial army England could easily be conquered.† His elder brother, Lord Montague, was reported ready to take arms, and his neighbor, the Marquis of Exeter, "only regrets that he has no opportunity to shed his blood for Katherine and Mary. If anything were doing, he would not be among the laggards." But the threads

\* *Spanish Calendars*, IV, part II, page 813

† *Letters and Papers*, VII, page 520.

of this conspiracy could not be drawn together, and it was surprised by an unpremeditated outbreak against the throne arising among the common people of the North.

England, north of a line drawn from the Wash to the mouth of the Humber, has until recent times differed much from the remaining two-thirds of the kingdom. It was always conservative, standing for things as they were or had been. In the civil wars of the seventeenth century it became the stronghold of the Crown. During the sixteenth century it rose intermittently against the Crown in attempts to restore the pillars of the old State, the aristocracy and the mediæval Church. It was thinly settled and the inhabitants lived by raising grain and cattle, with very little trade or manufactures. The instincts bred by feudalism lingered in the North long after they had perished elsewhere in England. The influence of the priests over the people was stronger than in the South, and the habit of fighting with the Scots and each other made the inhabitants apt to take to their weapons.

The monastery of Hexham stood near the debatable land of the border. Its stout walls and bold canons were a defense against the raids of the Scots, a refuge to retreating English raiders. In September the commissioners for its dissolution found the gates shut, the inmates in full armor standing on the roof, and the people of the neighborhood pouring in armed at the sound of the alarm bell. One of the canons, holding an arrow on the string of his bent bow, called out, "We be twenty brethren, and we shall die all ere you shall have the house." Before any steps could be taken to subdue these bold monks, Lincolnshire rose in rebellion. By the 6th of October, "ten thousand well harnessed men, with thirty thousand others, some harnessed and some not," were reported to be marching on Lincoln. "And the country rises wholly before them as they go."\* They cursed Cromwell, and a false rumor said they had hanged one of his men, sewed up another in a bullskin and then baited him with dogs. Their banner, displaying a plough and a chalice, and their demand for the expulsion of "vile blood" from the royal councils, indicates the mixed motives, agrarian, feudal, religious, which roused them.

Steps were at once taken to raise the royal levies. A list of two hundred and thirty-eight gentlemen and noblemen who were to muster from two men to a thousand has survived. But there was no need to put forth the strength of the kingdom. As the van of the King's forces approached, the insurgents began to

\* *Letters and Papers*, XI, 567.

break up and return to their homes.\* On the 13th of October, one week after the issuing of the commissions of array, Lincoln, the centre of the rebellion, was defenseless, and the gentlemen, who claimed to have been forced to join the Commons in this rising, were offering to come into the royal camp.

But on the same day that this news arrived in London, a message came from York, the second city of the Kingdom, asking aid against a new rebellion. It was far more serious than the first. On the 17th of October 40,000 men were reported under arms.† The leaders made every effort to organize the movement and force the whole North into it. The Commons were called to arms on pain of death. And if any gentleman refused the oath of the insurgents, he was to be put to death, the next of his blood put in his place, "and if he deny it, put him to death likewise, and so on."‡ This notice was to be posted on the doors of all parish churches.

In the mind of the lawyer Aske, who was its active leader, the movement was aimed against the statutes of Succession and Supremacy and the Act suppressing the smaller monasteries.§ The Commonalty rose in defense of the old institutions they loved and against the men who had changed them. "I trust to God," cried out a priest when the insurrection was in full swing, "we shall have the old world again." Their oath bound them to enter into "The Pilgrimage of Grace for the Commonwealth . . . . for the maintenance of God's faith and Church, preservation of the King's person and issue, purifying the nobility of all villains' blood and evil counselors to the institutions of Christ's Church, and suppression of heretic opinions."|| Their songs demanded that the innkeeper (Cranmer) should give place to the ancient nobles in the Royal Council and the shearnian (Cromwell) be hanged high as Haman.

However much power Henry might delegate to his ministers, he was always King of England—a strong-willed man and an able ruler of men. From the time when the trouble began in the North until it ended letters and reports came, not as before to Cromwell, but to Henry. And the orders of Government issued directly from the King. This was not simply to avoid irritating the rebels, one of whose chief demands was Cromwell's head. In the hour of danger the master wanted the helm in his own hand. There are no signs that Henry lost courage before the storm. There is in all

\* *Letters and Papers*, XI, 658, 694, 701.

† *Ibid.*, XI, 692, 758.

‡ *Ibid.*, XII, part I, 163.

§ *Ibid.*, XII, part I, page 405.

|| *Ibid.*, XI, page 272.

his letters no trace of any intention of yielding one bit to an insurrection raised, like most rebellions in the name of the throne it attacked, to free the King from evil counsels. He was angry with the Duke of Norfolk for making a truce with the insurgents,\* because, Norfolk said, his army was without fuel or provisions and the pestilence had begun among them. Henry sent commissioners to meet the rebel leaders in December, with instructions to grant a Parliament to assemble when he should appoint, and a pardon. If they demanded anything else the commissioners must ask twenty days' respite, secretly levy the forces of the nearest shires, of which 5000 men were to be ready at an hour's warning, hold the fords of the river Don, and wait till he advanced in person with the entire force of the kingdom at his back.† The royal terms were accepted, and a letter from the King invited Aske to London.‡ On his return he issued in January a manifesto that the King would order his subjects' petitions in Parliament to be shortly held at York.

But the North did not trust these promises. Two futile risings followed, and the Council of the North advised Henry to exercise great severity. He took their advice. These, as well as the two previous insurrections, were punished with the rigor which marked the suppression of rebellion in England down to the eighteenth century. Norfolk had been suspected by others beside the King of not wanting to fight the rebels. The Spanish Ambassador, writing to advise that the Pope should send Reginald Pole with money and musketeers to aid the insurrection, had reported that Norfolk sympathized with their demands. And the Pope, in telling the Spanish Ambassador at Rome that he had sent the money, said the rebels had found a new leader whose name ended in "folc."§ Norfolk was anxious to disprove the reports about his lack of zeal of which the King had informed him. He executed seventy-four by martial law, induced Aske and other leaders to go to London, and wrote advising that they never come back. "Hemlock is no worse in a good salad than I think the remaining of any of them in these parts should be ill to the Commonwealth."|| Cromwell was not inclined to show mercy to those who had asked his head and threatened England with civil war. Henry had always insisted on force and punishment, and accepted reluctantly the temporizing policy which Norfolk and his Councilors advised. None of

\* *Letters and Papers*, XI, 1226.

† *Ibid.*, XI, 1227.

‡ *Ibid.*, XI, 1306.

§ *Ibid.*, XI, 1159.

|| *Ibid.*, XII, page 311.

the leaders came back to the North, except in chains to be hanged. Aske, in private, just before his death (July, 1537), acknowledged that they had expected help from abroad, and accused the King and Cromwell of having promised him life if he would confess.\* There is other reason to believe that treachery mingled with severity in the punishment of the insurrection.

It made evident that the forces which desired a return to the old Church and State were not strong enough in England to stay the progress of the revolution which was destroying the institutions of the Middle Ages. Even in the northern counties part of the gentry and nobility could not be dragooned into joining the insurgents even by the threat of death. The great families had stood aloof and some country gentlemen had held their houses for the King by arms. The doubtful counties of Lancaster and Cheshire had offered 3000 men each for the King. Only seven out of the thirty-seven counties, and those the most thinly populated ones, were affected at all. Nor could the utmost inquiries of the Government find any dangerous signs of widespread sympathy in the rest of England. If the southern counties had backed the north the throne of Henry must have fallen.

The motives of the revolt were mixed, but it was predominantly religious, led by the priests and monks, or due largely to their influence. The Government answered by ordering the pulpits everywhere to attack the supremacy of the Pope and defend the new Anglican Church. And Cromwell did his best in every way to replace the Scholastic learning which underlay mediæval institutions and ideas by the new learning of the Renascence. A clergyman of Bristol felt this strongly and denounced the “new preachers preaching new learning with their new books. Their new learning is old heresy new risen like unto old rusty harness new furbished. And whereas they say they have brought in the light—no—no—they have brought in damnable darkness and endless damnation.”†

Just before this Northern rebellion, a new Parliament had been called, June, 1537, to secure the work of the Parliament of 1529. In a session of six weeks it established two new oaths on the Supremacy and the Succession. The first was to be taken by every ecclesiastical and temporal officer. It solemnly renounced the Bishop of Rome, his authority and jurisdictions, and promised support to the King as Supreme Head of England, in Church and State, against all opponents.

\**Letters and Papers*, XII, part II, page 121.

† *Ibid.*, XII, part I, page 528.

The second was appointed because the "whole peace, unity and greatness of realm and subjects depends upon the surety in the succession to the Crown." It promised to hold the marriage with Anne Boleyn invalid and to defend the succession of the children of Jane Seymour (made Queen May, 1536), or failing children by her, the right of the heir named by the King in his will. To refuse either oath was treason.

The tragedy of Anne Boleyn had been foretold by Wolsey because he knew Henry's brutal fickleness, by Thomas More because he knew Anne's vulgar levity. And only one child, a girl, had been born of her to meet the kingdom's need of heirs. As Henry's passion cooled into neglect Anne struggled desperately to hold her power. Cromwell told the Spanish Ambassador she was doing her best to get his head. She angered the King by hysterical reproaches for his infidelities. By the spring of 1536 a new divorce was talked of in Court circles, because of the lack of a male heir and the King's dislike for his wife. There would have been small difficulty in getting it from the subservient Archbishop for the same grounds on which he declared Anne's marriage null and void, May 17, 1536. But in the end of April Anne was accused to the King of adultery and desiring his death. Together with her brother, three courtiers and a Court attendant, she was arrested, tried before the peerage of England, the Mayor, Council and representatives from the trade guilds of London, declared guilty in the presence of a great crowd of spectators, and soon after executed.

All of the prisoners but one, who confessed adultery, asserted their innocence. The distinct and definite charges which have survived in summary are very difficult to reconcile with Anne's innocence of the entire indictment. The chief reason for doubting her guilt on all the charges is that some are too bad to be credible. The modern hypothesis that she was the innocent victim of a diabolical plot is not supported by evidence. If the object had been simply to smooth the way for another marriage, Anne's death, and certainly the death of five men, was unnecessary. And the hypothesis is therefore not only unsustained but superfluous.\*

Cromwell knew that the "Pilgrimage of Grace," the rising of the North for mediæval ideals against the new State, national and lay, independent of the Universal Church and the power of the clergy, had been connected with a Papal conspiracy to force England back to obedience. Of the nobles who had plotted with the Spanish Am-

\* This opinion is also suggested by Mr. A. F. Pollard, in his recent small but exceedingly strong *Life of Henry VIII.*

bassador, only Lords Hussey and Darcy had been involved in the Northern rebellion, and Cromwell did not know that the houses of Exeter and Pole had offered to serve the Emperor against the King. But he had gotten hold of the thread of conspiracy from the other end. Secret information from Rome told him that the Pope had made Reginald Pole Cardinal for England, with the express purpose, as the Pope himself said, of sending him "to Flanders, publicly to admonish the King to return to the Church, secretly to aid the Northern insurrection" with money and Church authority.\* He knew that Pole had written a most terrific indictment of Henry's policy, appealing for insurrection and foreign invasion, and that, on arriving in Flanders too late to help the insurrection, he threatened unless England returned to the Papal obedience to publish his attack, together with the suspended Papal excommunication calling on all Christians in and out of England to drive Henry from his throne, on pain of being outlawed in this world and damned in the next. Cromwell had tried to trepan Pole and bring him to England. Pole had slipped away to Rome, and Cromwell had written him a savage letter, hinting "that ways might be found in Italy to rid a treacherous subject"—a threat that greatly alarmed Pole, though a careful review of existing evidence implies that Cromwell did not try to carry it out.† Two subjects of the Emperor, who were trying to do precisely what Pole was trying to do, stir up war against their former sovereign, were assassinated in Italy by the Viceroy of Milan in 1540, certainly with Charles' approval, probably by his orders. And fanatic zeal was soon to make the assassin's arm a common weapon on both sides of the great hatred bred by disputes over religious opinions. But assassination does not seem to have been Henry's way. Not because it involved either treachery or cruelty. He shrank from those as little as most contemporary sovereigns. But Lord Herbert of Cherbury wrote, two generations after his death, "I do not find him bloody but where law, or at least pretext drawn from thence, did countenance his actions."

Though it is doubtful that Cromwell tried to assassinate Pole, he did make every other possible preparation to defend his policy against assault from Rome, which was using Pole as its chief implement. During the year 1538 he renewed his attack on the monk, that most characteristic product of the ancient world whose

\* *Letters and Papers*, XII, part I, 123, 1141. The last reference reports that the Pope does not want Pole to take Priest's orders that he may be ready to marry Mary and replace Henry on the throne.

† The editor of the *Letters and Papers* thinks differently.

institutions he was destroying. Over three hundred monasteries had been suppressed under the Act; two hundred friaries still surviving were now swept away.\*

There remained over two hundred large monastic establishments, which had been, as a whole, excepted from the charges of immorality presented against the smaller ones. The abbots of some of these were executed for complicity in the Northern rebellion; in which, Cromwell was informed, the priests and monks were the chief "doers". A process, not completed for three years, then began by which the heads of these large monasteries were induced to surrender their establishments to the King. The way for this course of action had been opened by the Act of Suppression, which, in addition to all monasteries under £200 annual income, had given to the King the property of any which might be granted to His Majesty by their abbots. It looked for some time as if there would be little difficulty in getting rid of the last corps of this class of men, among whom were to be found the most devoted adherents of the Pope. In many monasteries some monks wanted to abandon the monastic life. Six of the White Friars of Stamford, for example, signed a surrender, "considering that Christian living does not consist in wearing a white coat . . . . ducking and becking . . . . and other like papistical ceremonies."† Many abbots were willing to take the pensions or afraid to refuse surrender. Most of them doubtless simply yielded to the inevitable.

But while thus steadily moving in a policy which destroyed the centres of support for any invasion to carry out the Bull of Excommunication Pole had dangled like a sword of Damocles over Henry's head, Cromwell was watching for an excuse to strike hard at a certain section of the nobility which, if the threatened blow fell, would be still more formidable. These were the Yorkist nobles, the Marquis of Exeter, Lord Montague, Cardinal Pole's elder brother, and Sir Edward Neville. He was the son of Lord Bergavenny, whose father-in-law, the Duke of Buckingham, had talked of his claims to the throne, and revealed a mind to renew the War of the Roses if the death of Henry should leave the infant Mary, an unprotected little girl, as his heir. For these ineptious words Henry had sent him to the block in 1521. This was the knot of nobles—Exeter, Montague and Neville's father—which had been pointed out to the Emperor by his ambassador as able to put 20,000 men into the field, and to be depended upon to do so if they

\* Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the Suppression of the Monasteries*, Vol. II, page 239.

† *Letters and Papers*, XIII. part 2, 565.

were given the centre of an invading force. Cromwell did not know this. But he knew they were dangerous to his plans, and he used without the slightest scruple the first chance to indict them for treason.

He heard that a certain Hugh Holland had carried letters from Lord Montague to his brother the Cardinal. Holland was arrested and carried to London. Sir Geoffrey, the youngest Pole, frightened out of self-control, immediately volunteered confessions which threw the net around the men Cromwell wanted. There was no evidence of any overt act of treason, but there was stronger evidence of a will to destroy the Tudor monarchy than that by which Henry had executed Buckingham seventeen years before. And the modern presumption of the law among English-speaking people, that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty, did not obtain in trials for treason for more than five generations later. In 1614 a manuscript sermon attacking the Government and denouncing a death like that of Ananias or Nabal for the King was found among the papers of Edward Peacham, a rector of Somersetshire. It had never been preached, but with the approval of Francis Bacon he was tortured to extract evidence of a conspiracy, tried and condemned to death for treason. At the end of the eighteenth century Algernon Sydney died on the scaffold for opinions in an unpublished manuscript which Charles II and a Tory jury thought dangerous to the monarchy. There was current in England under Henry VIII a cant phrase to label the attitude of those whose opinions threatened the throne. As men spoke of the malicious "obstinacy" of heretics who dissented from the orthodox Church, so the adherents of the "new world" in England spoke constantly of the "cankered hearts" \* of those who longed for the ancient system in Church and State. Of such "cankered hearts" there was good evidence in the case of the prisoners. The breaking of the power of nobles and clergy, a career open to talents, the revolt from Rome, an indisputable succession to the throne—these things were against their feudal instincts and their religious feelings. "Knaves rule about the King," Sir Edward Neville was wont to sing, "but lords shall rule again one day." And Exeter, shaking his fist, said, "I'll give these knaves a buffet some day." Montague said, "The Northern rebels were fools to strike only at the Council. They should have struck at the head." Letters had been carried to the Cardinal and brought from him. At the news of the arrest some of these had been hastily

\* See *Letters and Papers, passim.*

burned. "They liked not the proceedings of the realm, they approved the opinions of Cardinal Pole." "The King will die suddenly," said Montague, "then we shall have jolly stirring."\* As remorselessly as they would have killed him and destroyed his work, Cromwell had them condemned for treason, executed in December, 1538, and their execution confirmed by Parliament in a bill of attainder. Montague's mother and Exeter's wife were included in the attainder, but they were not touched during Cromwell's lifetime.

On the 17th of December, 1538, the long-suspended Papal excommunication, condemning Henry and all who obeyed his magistrates to hell, making them outlaws and calling upon all Christians to attack and despoil them, was published.

Cardinal Pole was sent from Rome on a mission to the Emperor and the King of France. It was suspected, in spite of Pole's denials, that his errand was to persuade them to make peace and unite in a crusade against England. The suspicion was correct, as appears in Pole's *Apologia*, written at the time, and in Charles' report of his conversation to the Venetian Ambassador. For the Emperor told Mocenigo that Pole tried to persuade him to defer the Turkish expedition in order to attack England, and related his answer, pointing out the danger of leaving Italy open to Turkish attack if he withdrew his forces to attack England.† Henry and Cromwell did not know that Charles would take this view of the matter. In the middle of 1538 they had seen the war between France and Spain closed in a personal interview of Charles and Francis, in which they showed the most pleasant relations and swore eternal friendship. If France, Spain, Scotland and Ireland should attack England she would be ringed about by foes. Such a combination in support of a Papal Bull of Deposition, though difficult to form, was not impossible. The danger was not a paper one. The same threat fifty years later materialized into the great Armada, flying the banner of a crusade and bringing a Spanish army to drive excommunicated Elizabeth from her throne. The same spiritual power gave its chief strength to the Holy League and compelled Henry IV to be reconciled to Rome in order to gain peace for France. It is not "reading history backward"‡ to perceive that what caused and maintained war in the end of the sixteenth century

\* See the depositions against Neville, Montague and Exeter, *Letters and Papers*, XIII, part II.

† This conversation is reprinted in full in *The Emperor Charles V*, by Edward Armstrong, M.A., Vol. II, page 21.

‡ William Stubbs, D.D., *The Study of Mediæval and Modern History*.

was entirely capable of causing it at the beginning of the century. Contemporaries did not think the danger imaginary. The Spanish Ambassador writes from Venice that it is common talk throughout the city that Spain and France are to attack England.\* It would have been reckless indeed for the King and his minister to take this danger as lightly as some modern historians insist they ought to have taken it. Henry wrote instructions to enforce Cromwell's readiness to put England in a state of defense, adding as a spur to his work, "Diligence passe sence."†

Four thousand sets of armor and supplies of powder were bought in Germany. And the King tried to engage there 100 expert artillerymen.‡ Government ordered a general muster of the kingdom, and the rolls show that it was carried out, at least in part, for Wales and two-thirds of England. The following entry in the records of the Corporation shows what the capital did: "His Highness was lately informed that the cankered and venomous arch traitor Reynold Pole, enemy to God's word and his own natural country, had moved diverse great princes of Christendom not only to invade this realm of England with mortal war, but also by fire and sword to exterminate and utterly destroy the whole generation and nation of the same." . . . . "Thereupon His Highness in person took many journeys toward the sea coasts and caused many bulwarks to be made. He also caused towers to be built from the Mount to Dover and so to Berwick. He caused the Admiral to assemble all the navy at Portsmouth, and directed commissions throughout the realm to have his people mustered." . . . . "But when the Lord Mayor and his brethren were informed by Lord Thomas Cromwell, Keeper of the Privy Seal (to whom the city is and has been much bounden), that the King himself would see his loving subjects muster before him, they decided that no alien, even though he were a denizen, should muster, and that Englishmen who had jacks, brigandines or coats of fence should not go out, but only such as had white harness and full accoutrements."§ The parade took place on the 8th of May, 1539, and the French Ambassador estimated fifteen thousand men in the ranks, for those days a large force.

The surrenders of the greater monasteries had stopped with April, when two-thirds of the number had been surrendered, and from then until the 1st of November they did not average one a month,

\* *Letters and Papers*, XIV, part I, 372.

† *Ibid.*, XIV, part I, 529.

‡ *Ibid.*, XIV, part II, App. 14.

§ *Ibid.*, XIV, part I, 940; *Reprint from Archaeologia*, XXXII, 30

whereas for the previous sixteen months they had averaged about six a month. And the unsurrendered included a number of those most dangerous from the Crown's point of view. There were twenty-five mitred Abbots in England with the right to sit in the House of Lords; only seven of them had surrendered by the 1st of November, 1539. And the Government had reason to believe they were in communication to encourage one another in resistance. Cromwell determined to break their opposition. After his manner, he struck at the tallest heads. The Abbot of Glastonbury was, by virtue of his office, a great noble. The broad acres of the monastery lands were rated to supply from among their laborers and tenants twenty-five hundred men to the royal muster, and brought in one of the largest incomes in England. November 15th, 1539, he was executed on a charge of robbing the monastery church. On the same day the Abbot of Reading, two weeks later the Abbot of Colchester, were hanged on a charge of treason for having supported the authority of the Bishop of Rome over the King, desired the success of the Northern insurrection, and wished Cromwell and the other Councilors at Rome or in the North, *i.e.*, at the stake or on the gallows. The hiding of plate to keep it from the spoiler, talking against the changes in the Church and the Councilors who made them, these were doubtless being done in most of the monasteries left in England. They do not seem serious offenses. But the same Parliament which imposed the penalty of death for night fishing in a private fish pond, imposed the death penalty on them. Cromwell, who with all his lack of scruple was not inclined to bloodshed, might have left these offenses go. But he needed an example, and he made it. So far as we can judge, the evidence of the charges was quite sufficient to justify a verdict according to the laws made to defend the revolution in England against the plots of those within and without her bounds who wanted the "Old World" again.\* These laws, like most laws inspired by fear, were cruel.

The hard stroke broke the last resistance of the Orders. Within six weeks twenty-nine monasteries surrendered, among them ten mitred abbots. In another month the "standing army of the Pope" was entirely disbanded in England.

It has been estimated that the seven hundred and odd conventional establishments thus suppressed yielded to the royal treasury in gold and silver vessels, estimated simply at their melting

\* See letters on the subject in *Letters and Papers*, Vol. XIV. This judgment is made after full consideration of Gasquet's able special pleading for them. It is, perhaps, needless to remark that these laws, like most laws motived by fear, were cruel.

value, a sum equal to about five millions of dollars. Of the large quantities of jewels set in sacred vessels or shrines, no estimate can be found. The sale of monastic lands realized between forty and fifty millions. The income of monastic estates during the eleven years from the beginning of the suppression to the death of Henry was between twenty and twenty-five millions. Miscellaneous profits amounted to some three to four millions more. The last included the sale of everything in the monasteries down to the lead of the roofs. Cromwell was determined to make it difficult to restore monasticism. The great churches, the stately buildings which an Italian visitor in the beginning of the century described "as more like baronial palaces than monasteries," were carefully swept out of existence. From the church of Lewes, four hundred and twenty feet long, supported by pillars ten to fourteen feet thick, to the tiny house of Wilton, with its church thirty-four feet by fourteen, a cloister twenty-four feet long, a dortour sixteen feet by twelve, a little garden and meadow-ground of three acres, wherein dwelt one friar,\* all went down in ruin, an enormous destruction of beautiful creations of past generations. Of the eight thousand monks and nuns supposed to have lived in them, some who were priests received benefices, and about one-half were pensioned. Abbots of large monasteries received, on the average, from five to six thousand dollars a year; monks, on the average, about three hundred a year. Heads of smaller houses got less, ranging down to nine hundred dollars a year. Of the fifteen hundred friars and the fifteen hundred monks in the smaller monasteries who preferred going out into the world to transference to larger houses, some received a present of from ten to fifty dollars.

Henry was subject, like most monarchs of his day, to the vice of reckless extravagance, and like all selfish men, when he needed money was exceedingly greedy for it. This latter vice was exaggerated by popular report. And the hanged Abbot of Colchester doubtless expressed the opinion of many when he said: "The King and his Councilors were driven into such a covetous mind that if the Thames flowed gold and silver it would not quench their thirst."† Henry did not, however, take the greater part of the vast profits of the suppression of the monasteries for himself. In the many cases of suppressing monastic and ecclesiastical foundations during and since the sixteenth century, the privileged or

\* *Letters and Papers*, XIII, part I, 590.

† *Ibid.*, XIV, part II, 458.

influential classes have always tried to make their profit out of the situation. On the whole, perhaps as large a proportion of monastic property in England was devoted to public uses as in other suppressions when public opinion was unorganized and the people powerless to control and revise. Henry used in building and for personal and household purposes about twenty millions of dollars. Four or five millions went in pensions and expenses. The foundations of six new bishopries used up five or six millions more.

The bells of the monasteries were melted into cannon, and about forty millions, over half the royal profits from the dissolution, were spent on the fleet, coast defenses and military preparations to resist the invasions threatened by the Papal excommunication. Of the estates of the monasteries the King probably did not keep more than a quarter.\* He distributed the rest for nothing, or at a very low price, to the ancient nobility, to country gentlemen or to the "new men" he was raising to greatness by his service. For Cromwell's policy used greed as a factor, and his knowledge of human nature told him that the sharers of the spoils would never consent to the reversal of that by which they profited. From the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, the Marquis of Exeter, etc., down to the cooks in the royal kitchen, every one scrambled for a share in the spoils. And Cromwell took his share with the rest.† He accumulated a great estate in monastery lands. Its exact value cannot be estimated, but in rough numbers it brought him in between £2000 and £3500 a year, equal in purchasing value to between \$120,000 and \$200,000. His income from all sources was large. In 1536 it was between \$130,000 and \$150,000. During the years '37, '38 and '39 he received what is equivalent to between \$2,250,000 and \$2,500,000. His expenses ate up more than half this. But his accounts show that he invested some \$600,000 to \$700,000 in lands and annuities, and put over \$100,000 into a diamond and a ruby, probably because they were portable. His steward's books show a balance in his favor of £7000 (\$350,000 to \$400,000 modern value), which agrees with the account of the ambassador who wrote at his fall that people were surprised because much money

\* This account is condensed from Father Gasquet, who bases his reckoning on books of the Augmentations Office. The sums are roughly transferred into modern American values. It is held by most English writers that the purchasing value of money was then ten to twelve times what it is now.

† This summary account of Cromwell's finances is the result of a careful examination of all letters and accounts bearing on the subject in *Letters and Papers*, checked, so far as possible, by the *Valor Ecclesiasticus*.

was not found in his house, the total sum being only about £7000.

Cromwell made all he could out of his office and influence. The English of the sixteenth century seem to have given presents very much as the modern Chinese do, and the list of the things Cromwell received is most incongruous. It ranges from "twenty apples good to drink wine with" and "ten bags of sweet powder to lay among cloths," through a toothpick and a gold whistle, four live beavers, seeds from Barbary, a complete Innsbruck harness and six Bibles, to a thousand-weight of tin to make pewter vessels, and 18,000 slates to roof his new house. He took fees and bribes very commonly, and those possessed of any means who asked his help or influence generally sent money or a promise of money. Sometimes the gift was delicately conveyed in a pair of gloves, left under a cushion or elsewhere in the house. Much of this would be recognized as illegitimate at the time, for Sir Thomas More, who as Chancellor astonished his contemporaries by refusing to take any presents, was greatly praised for uprightness. But the condemnation was so formal that people did not lose caste by a practice which was universal and taken for granted. Wolsey received a huge pension from Francis I; and other nobles of Henry's Council, the Duke of Norfolk, the Bishop of Winchester, Earl of Worcester, etc., Cromwell's enemies as well as his supporters, received pensions from the Kings of France or Spain to look after their interests. The Councils of Switzerland, Germany and Flanders were equally, if not more, corrupt. The Fuggers were used to convey into Spain the foreign pensions of Councilors. When Francis Bacon, Chancellor, was condemned in 1621 for having taken bribes, he wrote, "And howsoever I acknowledge the sentence just and for reformation sake fit, I am the justest Chancellor that hath been in the five changes since Sir Nicholas Bacon's time" (1559).\* Practices so deeply condemned by modern opinion as to ruin those guilty of them persisted with small concealment and no rebuke among English State officials into the eighteenth century. Pitt created a great sensation and won an unmatched reputation for honesty in 1746 by refusing to accept commissions on foreign subsidies or appropriate the interest of balances in his hands. Cromwell's bribes and fees are not in the least to be defended, but it is unhistorical to separate his greed from its background and represent it as unusual in kind or even unique in degree.

This wealth Cromwell spent freely. He built a stately house

\* *Spedding*, Vol. II, p. 518. Ed. Boston, 1878.

opposite where the Stock Exchange now stands in the heart of London.\* The eight lots and four gardens of his building plot he bought for the equivalent of \$12,000 from his friend Antony Vivaldi.† The ward was then a good residence quarter in the outer edge of the city. The house, though stately, was not one of the magnificent palaces built in the Tudor age. A rough sketch which has survived indicates the heavy square gate tower common to contemporary architecture; a good specimen of which can be seen at Coughton, the seat of Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, whose false testimony brought Cromwell to the block. The building has since been destroyed by fire, but we have a description of the interior, made after Cromwell's death. It had a large banqueting hall, and ample kitchens well fitted for hospitality on a large scale. It was furnished like the house of one who shares the tastes of the Renascence. Whether he ever got from Flanders the dinner table, "of such size as there are few in England," about which his agent wrote in 1529, we do not know. Its price was forty crowns (equal to more than \$500), and it had a border with an inscription in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, the three languages whose combination was a symbol of the New Learning as against Scholasticism.‡ A mutilated list of his furniture at the time of his death shows that he had twelve pictures. No list of his books has survived. But there are scattered notices of them among his papers from the beginning of his power, when we find a poem, "Amongst all Flowers the Rose doth Excel," jumbled up with the "Estimate of charges of the King's house for a year"; "A Dialogue between Pasquillus and Maforius" next to "A list of wastes done by divers persons to the King's forests of Dean," and Italian verses between the "Supplication of the inhabitants of Rompney Marsh" and "The answer of the King of Denmark and his Secretary."§ Cromwell had attracted before he became great the friendship of men of literary tastes. Miles Coverdale, translator of the Bible; Henry Morley, author of a large number of works on Biblical criticism; Thomas Elyot, author of the Book of the Governor, a Latin Dictionary and a number of other books; Richard Morison, author of several treatises and translations; Thomas Starkey, one of the best writers of his generation on affairs of Church and State; John Palsgrave, who did much for the knowledge of French in

\* See description in Herbert, *Twelve Great Livery Companies of London*, under Drapers' Company.

† *Letters and Papers*, VII, 944.

‡ *Ibid.*, IV, part II, 5860.

§ *Ibid.*, VI, page 135.

England and wrote one of the earliest French grammars and dictionaries—all these were more or less intimate with him in his early days of law practice. And they made a circle very large in comparison to the limited number of literary men in England. These and other friends he made before his rise to power he kept. The contemporary Italian Bandello, afterward titular Bishop of Agen, made him the hero of one of his tales. It presents Cromwell in the most odious light, as a destroyer of the Church, who killed "an infinite number of monks, decapitated many great prelates of the holiest life and extinguished almost all the nobility of England." But it relates and praises his gratitude and magnificent liberality to a Florentine merchant who had helped him in his poverty-stricken youth and, having lost his fortune by the chances of trade, was in misery in London. The fact that this Italian monk, supporter of orthodoxy, chose the great heretic and schismatic for the hero of his tale on gratitude is a proof that Cromwell had the reputation that cannot be earned except by deserving it. Richard Morison wrote: "You are the only man in your place who has never forgotten his old friends."<sup>\*</sup>

Cromwell entertained largely, dining the King and foreign ambassadors. And his varied and witty conversations added to the pleasure of his guests. He kept a large household and took care to have men among them who could play on various instruments and make up a band.<sup>†</sup> He was evidently fond of music, for his steward paid a poor woman for bringing a nightingale, and "Mr. Reynolds' servant for bringing a cage of canaries," sums equal to over seventeen and twenty-five dollars.<sup>‡</sup> He kept a fool to amuse his guests,<sup>†</sup> and played bowls,<sup>‡</sup> cards and dice,<sup>‡</sup> losing at the latter Court amusements sums ranging from \$50 to \$1200. He shot with the long bow and hunted. But his favorite sport was hawking.<sup>§</sup> The gifts that pleased him best were hawks, spaniels or greyhounds. The Spanish Ambassador went out hawking with him, to find a good opportunity for a private talk, and his favorite sport colored his speech, for the ambassador reports that he said: "The Emperor and his agents, like hawks, rise high, to come down faster on their prey."<sup>||</sup> Just before his fall Parliament reenacted laws to prevent the destruction of hawks' nests and eggs. He kept nearly a hundred horses, but rode a mule to and fro between

\* *Letters and Papers*, XIII, part I, 1297.

† *Ibid.*, XIV, part II, 782.

‡ *Ibid.*, VIII, page 433; also above note.

§ *Ibid.*, V, 1281; VI, 1164, etc.

|| *Ibid.*, XII, part II, 629.

his house and Court.\* A bitter enemy said of him: "He was a great taker and briber, like his brother the Cardinal (Wolsey). No lord or gentleman in England favors him, because he will do for no man except for money, but he spent it honorably and freely like a gentleman (though he were none), and helped many honest men and preferred his servants well."† Nor was his hospitality limited to his friends. His steward's accounts show many entries of gifts to the poor, as, for instance, £6 20d., equal to some \$350, "to be distributed" in alms in the prisons about London.† And Stow, no friend of Cromwell, whom he thought guilty of an act of injustice to his father, says that when a boy he had seen more than two hundred poor fed twice a day at Cromwell's gate.‡

Around the house of Cromwell, with its filled banqueting hall and open gates, there centred not only friendship and gratitude but hatred. The hospitality which has any of its roots in extortion is apt to make more enemies than friends. And there were other reasons, beside the way in which he gained part of his money, which suggest to us how much he was disliked. The sincere and intense antipathy of extreme conservatives for a radical and opportunist, the malignant hatred which some members of any privileged class always feel toward the man who destroys their privileges, the honest indignation of religious men who believed that the mediæval Church was the divinely authenticated form of the Kingdom of God on earth—these varied motives engendered in the hearts of a large section of the English clergy a terrible anger against him.

The nobility also disliked Cromwell. Even those who may have come to acquiesce in the Tudor policy, which had destroyed their feudal independence, did not like the prominent instrument of that policy. Almost all the English nobles of ancient descent were men of small capacity. A paper is extant, found among the archives of the Papacy, in which some one has given a brief account of the heads of the English nobility—probably as a basis for judgment of the possibility of exciting successful religious war against the Crown. It passes favorable judgments on "The Duke of Norfolk, 72 years, the chief and best captain"; "The Marquis of Exeter, lusty and great power, specially beloved, diseased often with gout, next to the throne," and "The Marquis of Dorset, 26, with little or no experience, well learned and a great wit." But the more characteristic entries are: "The Earl of Oxford, 66 years,<sup>1</sup> a

\* *Letters and Papers*, XIV, part II, 337.

† *Ibid.*, XIII, part I, 471.

‡ Stow, *Survey of London*, Ed. 1618, page 139.

man of great power, little wit and less experience"; "The Earl of Derby, young, and a child in wisdom and half a fool"; "The Earl of Cumberland, a man of 50 years, without discretion or conduct"; "The Earl of Sussex, of little discretion and many words"; "The Earl of Bath, old and foolish"; "The Earl of Worcester, young and foolish"; "The Earl of Huntingdon, of great power, little discretion and less experience."\* The new nobles advanced by Henry received more favorable judgment. "The Duke of Suffolk" (Henry's brother-in-law), "a good man and captain, sickly and half lame"; "The Earl of Wiltshire, wise and little experienced, Queen Anne's father"; "The Earl of Hampton and Admiral of England, made by the King, wise, active and of good experience; one of the best captains in England"; "The Earl of Hertford, young and wise, brother unto the last Queen deceased."\*

The pride of an hereditary aristocracy degenerated in ability often bears an inverse ratio to its capacity, and its members resent particularly the rise of capable men to the influence and positions once wielded by their class. The new blood which the Tudors infused into the highest classes of English society was greatly to the advantage of the English nobility. The families they founded became the great families of later times. But the members of the played-out old lines did not welcome the newcomers, and they hated Cromwell more than the rest because his influence was greater, and he was not of gentle blood. Idle courtiers, who could not have led a company in war without disaster or managed the simplest affairs of State without confusion, had sneered at Wolsey as "the butcher's dog." Cavendish wrote of Cromwell "as a kite flying with royal eagles, a jay chattering in a golden cage." And in the same spirit the Marquis of Exeter, forced from the Royal Council, had shaken his fist at the "knaves" (base-born men) "who ruled about the King." The story, often repeated, that in 1536 he struck Cromwell with his dagger, which was turned by a secret coat of mail, is not very authentic. Cromwell may indeed have worn a secret coat of mail. For at the end of 1533 the Duke of Norfolk had asked the Venetian Ambassador to get five impenetrable coats, of the kind made at Brescia, for himself, the father and brother of Queen Anne, the Lord Treasurer and Cromwell.† They probably had some reason to fear a plot to assassinate them, though there does not appear to have been any. And the Spanish Ambassador reports the delivery of five coats of secret scale armor as a

\* *Letters and Papers*, XIII, part II, 732.

† *Calendars, Venetian*, Vol. IV, pp. 374, 382.

present from the Venetian Senate.\* But it is highly improbable that Exeter ever probed for this on Cromwell's body with his dagger. The story rests only on the malicious denunciation before a Somersetshire magistrate of the boastful words of a butcher, said to have been spoken six months before they were denounced. But we do not need this anecdote to tell us that most of the nobility, like the orthodox clergy, were enemies of Cromwell for reasons both good and bad.

It has been so frequently repeated that Cromwell was generally hated because he filled England with spies that it is a little surprising to find how little ground for the charge is found in the State Papers. If Cromwell sustained a general spy system throughout England, or had a regular establishment equivalent to the secret service men of modern governments, it would plainly appear in their reports made to him of arrests for seditious and treasonable words. The ancient laws of England made "tale-bearing" against "the great men of the realm" a serious offense. A statute of Edward I,† twice confirmed under Richard II, ordered the imprisonment of any one repeating "such scandalous reports until he had brought into court him who was the first author of the tale," to be punished by the Royal Council. The new law making it treason to call the King heretic, schismatic or infidel, or to deny the legitimacy of his heir or impugn his title of Head of the Church, had commended to all magistrates the enforcement of the old as well as the new law. I have examined in the *Calendars* reports of ninety odd arrests under these laws, new and old, made to Cromwell between 1533 and 1540, practically all that exist. In none of them is there any suggestion of a system of spies to watch the people or report their inept words. A King's commissioner, a yeoman of the Crown, a commissioner of subsidy, each report one case; several county magistrates, evidently seeking to curry favor, report a few cases; in five cases a constable or bailiff seems to be the chief accuser. Even this does not indicate any "spy system." And the overwhelming majority of the cases are denunciations before the local magistrates by ordinary inhabitants of town or village--tinkers, ironmongers, fullers, weavers, butchers, etc. They show that numbers of the people throughout England believed in the laws or were freely willing to use them. Some fifteen to twenty cases are the denunciations of parsons by their parishioners, who evidently want an incumbent of the "new learning."

\* *Calendars, Spanish*, Vol. V, part I, page 74.

† III, Edward I, 34.

In ten cases priests denounce another priest. This also probably was the "new learning" against the "old learning." Some ten cases look like simple malicious false witness growing out of a quarrel; and most of these are so commented upon by the magistrates who report them. The examination of these hundred cases is very far from suggesting the presence or the need of a body of spies to keep down the people.

In the year 1540 Cromwell suddenly fell before his enemies. April 17th he was made Earl of Essex; July 28th he was beheaded. He had long foreseen his misfortune. He told the Spanish Ambassador in 1536, "He had admitted to himself that the day might come when fate would strike him as it had struck his predecessors in office; then he would arm himself in patience and place himself for the rest in the hands of God."\* During the year 1540 Cromwell's foreign policy had brought him into disfavor with his master. It crossed the theological beliefs of the King and it made him personally uncomfortable. Cromwell prepared to resist the possible invasion of France and Spain in support of the Papal bull excommunicating Henry, not only by fortifications and musters, but also by alliances. Against such a combination England must obviously seek allies in the North. Cromwell did his best to form an alliance with the anti-Imperial and anti-Catholic Princes of Germany. In this he found one practically insurmountable obstacle—the theological differences between the Lutheran and English Churches. Most of the Lutheran divines received from Luther himself a great tenacity of theological opinions and a strong intolerance for dissent. They had refused to join a defensive league with the Zwinglians; many of them were to refuse fellowship with the Reformed of France. After examining the doctrines of the English Church they advised their Princes not to make alliance unless the English accepted the true Word of God—namely, the formulas of the Lutheran Church. But, far from doing that, an Act of Parliament in June, 1539, made the Six Articles the test of religious orthodoxy in England. These denounced the penalty of death against all who spoke or wrote against transubstantiation, communion in one kind, the need of celibacy in the clergy, the perpetual obligation of monastic vows, private masses or auricular confession.

For some years Cromwell had been encouraging in England the spread of Lutheran opinions. Between 1536 and 1539 two books were printed containing *The Augsburg Confession* and *Melanchthon's Apology*, "translated by Richard Tavernier at the com-

\* *Calendars, Spanish*, V, part II, p. 82.

mandment of Lord Thomas Cromwell." He had not only licensed Coverdale's translation of the Bible, but, as he told the French Ambassador, spent six hundred marks (equivalent to some \$20,000) in getting it printed. It finally appeared in 1539 with Cromwell's arms upon the title-page, and a Preface setting forth a "Summary and Content of Scripture" quite Protestant in tone.\* He must have used his influence to promote clergymen of anti-orthodox opinions, for the heretical Bishop Latimer wrote him in the end of 1538, saying that "your Lordship has promoted many more honest men since God proinoted you than any of like authority have done before you."<sup>†</sup> By the beginning of 1539 Cromwell was regarded by all who wished to see England advance rapidly toward the position taken by the Protestant Princes of Germany or the Zwinglian Cantons of Switzerland as the hope of "the gospel" in England. Their opinion of him may be fairly represented (making due allowance for the tone usual in Prefaces to patrons) by the dedication of Richard Morison's *Apomaxis*, published in the middle of 1538: "Who that knows anything is ignorant that all things depend on you? Who does not wonder at your bodily strength, broken by no labours? It is incredible that the strength and memory of one man can suffice for so many and such divergent affairs. You receive all suppliant letters, you hear all complaints, you send few from you without help, either in the trouble itself or, next best, by counsel. Is there any one distinguished by virtue or learning or any of unusual mental powers whom you have not aided? All, except very few, gladly see conquered and bound by you Popes, heaps of indulgences, pounds of lead, wax easily moulded to evil (Papal seals), a thousand stratagems of fraud, huge armies of rapine and finally the bodyguards of Papal rule—Force, Terror, Cruelty, Flames, Threats, Thunders—captive, sad and hopeless, following the triumphant chariot.

"May Christ long keep you safe to ornament our State and make plain our gospel."

How far Cromwell was moved by conviction in thus promoting Protestant opinions is difficult to determine. His early literary friends, with the exception of Lord Morley, had moved toward heresy as well as schism, and Cromwell may have moved with them. In any case we may assume that he thought more of England than of theology. Probably he concluded that, if England was to

\* In the title-page of the subsequent editions under the Royal patronage the arms of Cromwell have been cut out of the plate, leaving a blank in the engraving. See copies in the British Museum.

† *Letters and Papers*, XIII, part II, 1036.

be kept from connection with Rome, she must not only break with the mediæval Papacy, but also with some doctrines of the Scholastic theology, for the two hang so closely together that it is hard to separate them. And he understood that if any permanent alliance was to be formed in Germany some concession must be made to the doctrinal prepossessions of the Lutherans. Now the King was not at all inclined to rapid divergence from old theological opinions. He piqued himself on his knowledge of theology. He hated Luther, who in 1522 had handled him without gloves in controversy. And he was so averse to heresy that Cromwell had not been able in 1531 to get him to have any dealings with Tyndale, in spite of the strong support to theories of absolute power given to Kings by God contained in Tyndale's book. In protecting men who held opinions denounced by the Act of Six Articles, Cromwell was playing the dangerous part of forcing the hand of the King, a thing which Henry always deeply resented.

In addition, Cromwell's policy had made Henry uncomfortable, and that had come to be in his eyes the worst possible offense. To cement the German alliance, Henry, a widower since 1537, had married Anne, sister of the Duke of Cleves, whose rich and fertile domains in the Rhine country, on the borders of the Netherlands and Germany, made him a sort of diplomatic centre for any anti-Imperial European alliance. Before Cromwell came to power the advantages of marriage into this family, whose eldest daughter was wife of the Elector of Saxony, head of the defensive League of Lutheran Princes, had been laid before the King in a memorial of Herman Ring (May, 1530). The King had been told that Anne was very beautiful and, satisfied with the reports and a portrait painted by Holbein, had agreed to the marriage. When she came to England to be married, a glance made plain that she was not at all beautiful. The King at first sight took a great dislike to her, and tried hard to get out of keeping his promise to make her his wife. Cromwell pointed out how impossible this was, and he reluctantly went through the ceremony. But woe be to the man who forced him to do what he disliked. An intense irritation gathered in his heart. And the desire to get rid of Anne was increased by his liking for Katherine Howard, a pretty young niece of the Duke of Norfolk. Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, head of the orthodox clerical party and Cromwell's bitterest opponent, gave the King opportunity to meet Anne's rival in his palace.\*

\* *Letters and Papers*, XVI, page 114, and *Letters from Richard Hillis, Zurich Letters*, Vol. I, page 200.

Cromwell was aware of his danger, but saw no way to avoid it. Sir Thomas Wriothesley, one of the King's secretaries, deposed that five months after the marriage, "He asked Lord Cromwell to devise some way for the relief of the King, for if he remained in this grief and trouble they should all one day smart for it. To which Lord Cromwell answered that it was true, but it was a great matter. 'Marry,' said Sir Thomas, 'I grant, but let the remedy be searched for.' 'Well,' said Lord Cromwell, and broke off."

The French Ambassador perceived that a fight for the control of the State had begun. The party of reaction, with Gardiner and Norfolk as its leaders, and the radical progressive party, under Cromwell, had locked arms for a battle to the death. The orthodoxy of Henry, his dislike for Anne, his growing passion for pretty Katherine were strong cards held by Gardiner. But Cromwell was an old player and it looked for a moment as if he would win. On the 1st of June the French Ambassador reports the Bishop of Chichester in the Tower on a charge of treason and adds: "A trustworthy person says he heard from Cromwell that there were still five bishops who ought to be treated thus, whose names, however, cannot yet be learned; unless they are those who lately shook the credit of Master Cromwell so that he was very near coming to grief. Things are brought to such a pass that either Cromwell's party or the Bishop of Winchester's must succumb. Although both are in great authority and favour of the King, their master, still the course of things seems to incline to Cromwell's side, as Winchester's chief friend, the Bishop of Chichester, is down."\* On the 7th of June the Bishop of Chichester wrote to Cromwell a letter from the Tower showing an inclination to be used against the leaders of the clericals.\* Then the frightened opposition struck a blow which they must have plotted some days before. On the 10th of June Cromwell was arrested for treason in the Council chamber itself.

He recognized in an instant that the ground was counterminded beneath his feet by some false but plausible witness. A charge of treason against Cromwell, who lived to exalt the throne, was ridiculous. As he saw his work undone by the tricky but incapable Norfolk and the able but reactionary Winchester, he flung his cap on the ground in sudden wrath, appealing to their consciences whether he was a traitor, and bidding them not let him languish long in prison. The French Ambassador understood it perfectly as a faction fight "between this King's ministers who are trying to destroy each other. Cromwell's party seemed the

\* *Letters and Papers*, XV, pages 351, 360.

stronger lately, but it seems quite overthrown by the taking of the said Lord Cromwell, who was chief of his band.”\* The King sent the ambassador word that “he wished by all possible means to lead back religion to the way of truth. Cromwell, as attached to the German Lutherans, had always favored the doctors who preached such erroneous opinions, and that recently warned by some of his principal servants to reflect that he was working against the instructions of the King and the Act of Parliament, he said that the affair would soon be brought to such a pass that the King with all his power could not prevent it, but rather his own party would be so strong that he would make the King descend to the new doctrines even if he had to take arms against him.”\*

The King’s irritation, caused by dislike for Anne and liking for Katherine, had increased, while at the same time the peace of the Duke of Cleves with the Emperor, and a truce between Charles and the French King made Henry fear that the marriage he hated was a political mistake. His distaste for heresy deepened. And at the psychological moment, when the unconscious dislike for the minister who had been the means of making him uncomfortable was ready to burst into the fury of a selfish man who is crossed, a sudden false accusation evoked the terrible pride of the King. Rich, Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, and Nicholas Throgmorton, with whom Cromwell had long been at odds, accused him of having said two years before: “If the King would turn from it (the promotion of the Protestant doctrine), yet I would not turn; and if the King did turn and all his people, I would fight in the field in mine own person with my sword in my hand against him and all others.” They added that he pulled out his dagger with the words: “Or else this dagger thrust me to the heart, if I would not die in that quarrel against them all.”

To have desired insurrection against the Crown was against all Cromwell’s ideas, to have plotted a hopeless rebellion was utterly at variance with his sagacity, to have expressed his intent before a personal enemy like Throgmorton was a lack of caution impossible in one who had so long walked with firm step the slippery corridors of Henry’s palaces. A son of Cromwell’s grandchild informed Fuller that, when told by Rich and Throgmorton that he had an accuser of want of fidelity, he had replied, “Were he here now I would strike my dagger into his heart.”

Cromwell might have said this. He was not fool enough to have said the other before such witnesses, even in the highly improbable

\* *Letters and Papers*, XV, 766, 767.

event of feeling it. Like Sir Thomas More, Cromwell accused Rich of plain perjury. Whether distortion or sheer invention, the false witness served its purpose. The King at once believed it, though later he came to think it false.

Cromwell had forced him into a hated marriage. He had encouraged heresy when the King loved orthodoxy. Henry had unconsciously wanted an excuse for a nervous discharge of rage which might relieve his irritated egotism. He stripped his favorite of all his dignities, and every incapable scion of a noble house in England rejoiced that the "base knave" who had risen to the head of the English State, because he was the most capable man of affairs in it, was in accordance with royal edict to be spoken of as "the shearman." The contemporary chronicler tells us that "many lamented" his arrest, but "more rejoiced, and especially such as had been religious men or favored religious persons, for they banqueted and triumphed together that night, . . . and some, fearing lest he should escape although he were imprisoned, could not be merry. Others, who knew nothing but truth by him, both lamented him and heartily prayed for him."

At the Courts of France, Spain and Rome the news of his fall was received with great joy, which, curiously enough, has been taken by some modern writers as an indication of the injury his ministry had done to England. From France came accusations apt to insure his death—that he had plotted to marry the Princess Mary and seize the Crown. No pretense was ever made of sending the promised proofs when the King asked for them after Cromwell's death.

From that death nothing could save him. For many generations later little stood between a fallen minister and the scaffold. A threat of the axe was the ancient equivalent of a vote of want of confidence. From Wolsey, who died on his way to death, the list is long of fallen rulers of England who saw the scaffold on their path. More, Cromwell, Norfolk, Seymour of Sudeley, Somerset, Northumberland, Norfolk, Buckingham, Stafford, Charles I, Sir Henry Vane, Clarendon, Danby, Shaftesbury and the Councilors of James II, all met death or looked hard upon the axe. During a century and a half, on the average, once in ten years a leader of the English State died on the scaffold or was in danger of it. None of these men, with the possible exception of Northumberland, could be convicted or attainted of treason by a modern jury or Parliament. Cromwell was therefore only one in a long list of those who came to the steps of the scaffold by the violence of English political parties.

He understood that his one hope of mercy lay in the will of the King, and tried by the most abject efforts to placate the diseased egotism he knew so well. It was his last card in the game of life, and he played it with the same lack of dignity which his antagonist, the Duke of Norfolk, head of the English aristocracy, showed when his turn came. He got nothing by it, except that the title and estates were left undisturbed to his son, which was, perhaps, all he hoped.

The men of the sixteenth century often died better than they lived. There is no particular reason to doubt the authenticity of Cromwell's prayer on the scaffold, in which he humbly repents of all his sins, trusting in the mercy of God, and asking that the righteousness of Christ might hide and cover all his unrighteousness. Those sins were many. But, to put his career against the background of his times, and look at it with the eyes of a man who believes in God and righteousness rather than with those of an ecclesiastic who believes that the world gets at God and righteousness only by a Church establishment, is to see that there was in them no peculiar tinge of sinister wickedness. He was the most active servant the Tudors found in destroying mediaeval institutions. He stood for a career open to talents and the energies of England, going out in the light of the new learning and the new patriotism unto those paths of thought, of industry, of adventure, which have brought the men who speak the English tongue into their inheritance. Therefore the distant North and the ancient nobility hated him. But those who knew him best liked him most. He struck hard at those who opposed his plans, but he did not willingly shed blood which seemed needless, and he helped many of the weak. He took bribes and sold his influence, but it is nowhere recorded of him that he ground the faces of the poor. He did not die, like Wolsey, unlamented. His arrest had been secret and sudden because of fear of trouble in the city. A war of broadside ballads arose over his death which had to be suppressed by the Council, and the joy at Madrid, Paris and Rome was broken by laments from Germany and the Netherlands over the deeds of the English Nero and the martyrdom of the friend of the Gospel. For in those days nobody judged a man by what he was or what he did, but by his attitude toward their faction in religion and politics.\*

It was easier for the King to get rid of a good servant than to find another. Wolsey, More and Cromwell were the ablest men

\* It is impossible to write the history of the sixteenth century fairly until this fact is more clearly and widely recognized than it has been.

he raised to high office in the State. Within a year of Cromwell's death, the Spanish Ambassador tells us, "the King has no confidence in his ministers, and sometimes even reproaches them with Cromwell's death, saying that upon light pretexts, by false accusation, they made him put to death the most faithful servant he ever had."\* The last part of Henry's reign was the least successful. He began to shed blood which, from any point of view, was superfluous, so that the French Ambassador reports: "Cromwell was reckoned the sole deviser of the death of so many people, but it appears since that he was not altogether author of that piteous tragedy, but rather played his part as it was rehearsed to him."† No one could be found to manage the English finances. The debasement of the coinage, continued during Henry's reign before Cromwell came to power, suspended as long as he had influence, went on again worse than ever, until Elizabeth made her generation pay for the mistakes of their forefathers by returning it to purity and beginning to build up again the ruined credit of England.

Cromwell left no account of his motives and no description of his policy. He shed without remorse the blood of men who, if they could have gained the power they asked the Spanish King and the Italian Pope to help them gain, would have killed him without an instant's hesitation, and thought it God's service to destroy all his work. He increased by every means the power of the throne, because, in common with many of the ablest statesmen and writers of the age, he believed an absolute Prince to be the only security for national peace and national prosperity. But he did not try to strengthen the throne by creating a standing army or disarming the people. He defended his policy by the pulpit and the printing press. He used the arts so long familiar to English ministers to manage Parliament, but he appealed to the consent of the nation through it, and increased the potential of liberty. He broke England from all connection with the Papacy. He tried to make that alliance with the nations of the North in which England afterward found safety. He fostered the Renaissance against mediævalism, the new learning against the old. He reduced the Welsh and Scotch borders to order. He helped the destruction of local jurisdictions and made it possible to bring them under the common law. He maintained the stability of the succession by a policy which defended the loyalty to the throne that carried England through the sixteenth century without a great civil war. He finished the breaking of the feudal nobility, eager to renew the

\* *Letters and Papers*, XVI, 590, page 285.

† *Ibid.*, XVI, page 289.

War of the Roses, and kept the path open to talents. He aided trade, retrieved the finances and stopped the adulteration of the coinage. He swept monasticism from England as an anachronism which had outgrown its usefulness, and used half its wealth for national purposes. He broke the temporal power of the clergy and put the national Church under the same control as all other national affairs. Most of this is so opposed to certain theories of Church and State that it seemed to their advocates a diabolical work, even as it seemed to their opponents a blessed work. The truth is that Thomas Cromwell was neither martyr of Protestantism nor Satan's agent to attack the Church; but a statesman working hard to give England an efficient government, and to guide her safely during the difficult transition from the mediæval to the modern State. Close mouthed and unscrupulous as he was, there was nothing particularly mysterious about his methods nor uniquely sinister about his personality.

He sought to advance his own fortune, but it seems plain that he aimed in addition at something else. Surely labors so consistent and efficient must have been inspired by some other motive and reason than the greed of a crafty adventurer flattering a tyrant. And if, without theological prejudice or ecclesiastical bias, we judge him for what he was, a person whose ideals were predominantly secular, we find him morally neither better nor worse than the average man of his age; if we judge him by what he did, it seems difficult to deny him a place among the most capable statesmen of all ages.

*Princeton University.*

PAUL VAN DYKE.

## II.

### THE PLACE OF ὁικοδομή IN NEW TESTAMENT WORSHIP.

EVERY religion rests upon two things: the first is that God can speak to man, the second is that man can speak to God. Revelation and prayer are the supports of all devout living, and the pillars upon which every temple of worship is reared. No true worshiper is dumb, because there ever bends a hearing heaven above his place of prayer. The philosopher may cast his thoughts in monologues; but religion is ever a dialogue, a spiritual conversation, in which God speaks through visions or dreams or ecstacy, or voices of nature or sacred books, or prophetic souls, and man responds with vows and sacrifices, offerings and thanksgivings, petitions and ceremonies of adoration. The relation and proportion of these divine and human factors in worship show the greatest diversity. The thousandfold conceptions of God, man, sin, human destiny, and happiness color and shape the religious services which are supposed to be pleasing unto God and profitable for men.

The nature religions of Greece and Rome, in fact, all pagan cults, as a rule, regarded the human part of worship as a means of winning the divine. Man acted to induce God to act. It was a *Do ut des*, often of a very commercial and bartering character. Offerings from flock or herd or field were given the gods in order that they in return might protect and multiply man's possessions and guard the worshiper from all ill. This worship was also of a magical, superstitious, theurgic nature, which led man by asceticism, initiation and a great variety of ceremonies to seek to gain and deserve the mysterious favor of the gods of nature and human destiny. Every virtue and every vice regarded as pleasing to the gods was practiced by their followers, that such flattering imitation might induce the supernal powers to grant man his desires.

Judaism, also, while rising far above the barter and mysteries of the Gentiles, could not shake off its local, national and legalistic character. The revelation of Jehovah in Israel commanded certain legal observances, a ritual well-pleasing to God, in keeping of which there was great reward. Later Judaism centered devotion in arbit-

trary laws respecting the Sabbath, tithes and ceremonial purification. The Old Testament prophets broke away from this current legalism; yet the Jews never ceased to consider acts of devotion as commands of God; their performance was obedience to God; and such obedience merited reward from God. Paganism as the seeking religion and Judaism as the hoping religion could not help regarding worship as a means by which the hidden God might be revealed and the far-off God brought nigh. The Rabbis of old taught that if Israel would keep the law but for one day the Messiah would come.

The Christian view of worship was very different. Instead of an unknown and far-off God, the gospel proclaimed a God present in Jesus Christ. In Him the historic, the incarnate Son of God, the Fullness of the Godhead was bodily revealed to meet all the needs of men. This God-Man, as Origen described Him, was invisibly but really present in the midst of every company of believers. Hence New Testament worship had its object of love and adoration and praise as part of the religious assembly, in a peculiar sense. It proceeded at once from the consciousness that this meeting of Christians already possessed all things. God was not in heaven to be brought down, or in the deep to be brought up; He was nigh every believer in Christ. He needed no longer an offering to placate Him, or gifts to induce Him to be gracious. Salvation, grace without measure, eternal life, all things were now in possession of the Church, for she was Christ's and Christ was God's. No longer must man seek God in local shrines or by peculiar offerings; God had come to man in Christ; and to every worshiper in spirit and truth the Divine Father opened all the treasures of heaven. Apostolic worship meant, accordingly, an immediate appropriation of the good things of God in Christ. It was no longer pursuit; it was possession; hence the leading thought in this early devotion was not so much worshiping God as it was edifying the brethren. Not even praising Christ was the chief duty, but rather building up His body, the Church in love. The feeling seemed to be that God did not need the adoration of men, or Christ wish for their thanksgivings, except as shown in the edification of those whom God loved with infinite compassion and for whom Christ died. Weizsäcker says of the early Christian meetings: "What took place aimed not at exerting influence upon the Godhead; it did not even seek first of all to worship, but to share the common faith as such" (S. 566).\*

This principle of edification is far-reaching. We shall perhaps better see its great importance in Christian worship if we refer

\* *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christl. Kirche.*

briefly to the significance attached to it in the life and labors of the apostolic Church.

The word *οἰκοδομέω* occurs often in the Synoptist Gospels in its literal sense. It describes building a house (Matt. vii. 24), a church (xvi. 18), a tower (xxi. 33), a temple (xxvi. 61), a synagogue (Luke vii. 5), and the tombs of the prophets (Matt. xxiii. 29). It soon, however, passes over into figurative usage. We then hear of the churches having rest and being edified (Acts ix. 31). Paul applies this term to preaching where another had labored before him (Rom. xv. 20). He later sums up the whole work of Christian love in edifying (1 Cor. viii. 1). He delights to use this word spiritually. It builds up a man's character. It shows a Christian how to avoid even lawful things that do not build up his religious life (1 Cor. x. 23). It is the great test in all varieties and liberties of Christian worship, in which everything must be done unto edification. Paul calls the Corinthian Christians God's building; and assured them that when their earthly tent was dissolved there remained for them a heavenly building (2 Cor. v. 1). They grew together upon the foundations of Christ, the apostles and prophets into a building, a holy temple. In fact, Paul describes the whole Christian life as an *οἰκοδομή*, a spiritual building. In that striking passage, Eph. ii. 1-17, where he outlines religious experience, he employs the idea of building four times to describe its many-sidedness. The Christian is called a building which is built *upon* Christ, and is framed together *with* Christ into an organism that grows into a temple; finally, he is said to be built *together* with fellow-believers. A little later the whole work of Christian growth is said to consist in the edification of the Church in love (Eph. iv. 16). Not only is Christian nurture or the inner growth of the Church set forth from the point of view of edification, but this same principle forms the rule to guide the Christian in all his contact with the world. He must think of the possible edification of every man. He must put himself in the place of his fellow-citizen or fellow-believer, and from his point of view seek to do all things unto human and religious edification. In all questions of right and expediency, of which meat offered to idols was an illustration, Paul's test was the glory of God and the good of the weak fellow-man. He writes: "Give glory to God" and "give no offense neither to the Jew, nor to the Greek, nor to the Church of God." The way to glorify God was to edify as far as possible the Jew, the Greek, and the weak brother for whom Christ died (1 Cor. x. 31f.). The touchstone for action in the midst of a heathen world was: "Let every one . . . please

his neighbor for good, to his upbuilding," or to edifying. The limit of pleasing a neighbor, or toleration of doubtful things, or expediency, was when the edification of the man ceased.

So dominant was this principle of edification in the mind of Paul that he recognized it as controlling every exercise of his own apostolic authority. He says: "I could boast . . . of the authority which the Lord has given us"—but at once adds the limit to such glorying; it was to be "for edification and not for your destruction" (2 Cor. x. 8). Church authority was nothing compared with spiritual help to a single believer. He repeats the principle: "We do all things . . . for your upbuilding" (2 Cor. xii. 19). And still again he repeats it, saying he might use sharpness, yet even that would be "to edification and not to destruction" (2 Cor. xiii. 10). And of course the greater included the less. If apostolic men did their work guided by the rule of edification, much more should all others. In Paul's solemn farewell to the elders of Ephesus he told them that the word of God's grace was able to edify Christians and give them an inheritance among all them that are sanctified (Acts xx. 32). He elsewhere goes on to say that the whole work of the ministry of the Word, whether exercised by apostles or prophets, or teachers or evangelists, or pastors or any testifying believer, was to consist in the building up or the edifying of the body of Christ. The test of every Christian utterance, in church or out, in religious or secular circles, was to let nothing proceed out of the mouth, "but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace to the hearers" (Eph. iv. 29). The salt of gracious speech was its edifying power. This was especially true of all systematic setting forth of doctrines, and of all theological discussion. The spiritual needs of man should ever color, fashion and animate the teachings of the Church. Paul assured Timothy that no novelty of view or scientific acumen, or unique wisdom, or apologetic brilliancy, or treasures of knowledge should outweigh that "godly edifying, which is in faith." This theological edification, he adds, produced charity, a pure heart, a good conscience and faith unfeigned (1 Tim. i. 4).

This brief *résumé* of New Testament teachings respecting the place of ὁἰκοδομὴ in Christian nurture, mission activity, holiness of life, usefulness, growth of the Church, apostolic authority and the general work of the ministry will help us to appreciate the unique position given it in Christian worship. Apostolic worship was very closely connected with the everyday social life of the Christian. It had all the freedom of the family circle and all the spontaneity

of friendly intercourse. The brotherhood came together to greet one another, inquire about religious activity, report religious experience, testify in the spirit, receive inspiration from Jesus Christ who was ever in their midst, bring gifts for the poor, instruct and encourage one another, and share the good things of the common salvation. Our old word meeting describes primitive devotion much better than the term worship, which suggests ritual and formal services. The first picture of a church in the apostolic brotherhood was that of Jesus and the twelve talking of the kingdom of God by the wayside to the multitudes, and then in the house of Peter or Lazarus or Mary of Jerusalem singing a hymn at table and giving thanks for daily bread. Only twice is the Lord said to have used the word church: in one case (Matt. xvi. 18) he referred to the worldwide company of His followers, against whom the gates of hell should not prevail; in the other he described it as two or three gathered together in His name with Himself in their midst (Matt. xviii. 16-20). This church of two or three had full authority for the double duty of dealing with the brother who had trespassed and, by agreeing together in their prayers to the Father in heaven, of calling down all the blessings of Christian worship (Matt. xviii. 15-20). In free devotion, bound to no local mountain or sanctuary, Jesus taught His disciples to worship the Father in spirit and in truth (John iv. 21). This conception at once passed over into the apostolic Church. Stephen and Paul and John declared God was not worshiped in temples made with hands or by priestly ritual or bloody sacrifices, "as though He needed anything" (Acts xvii. 25); all these were part of the yoke of the law, which Peter declared no longer rested upon Christian necks. Jesus said the fanatical Jews could kill one of His followers and think such a deed of blood an offering to God, an act of worship, a *λατρεία*, that would induce God to grant him a special reward. Every zealot believed he could open heaven at the point of the sword, and by deeds of religious valor induce Jehovah to reward him with Paradise. Very different was the atmosphere of Christian devotion. Paul could wish himself accursed from Christ if thereby his Jewish brethren might be saved. Between these extremes, however, there ran a quiet synagogue worship which gave great prominence to the element of teaching; and there is no doubt but its edifying features passed over into the Jewish Church. The temple service, in which the sacrifices, the altar, the priests, the choirs of singing Levites, the ritual, the prayers of adoration and confession, the Godward aspect of worship were conspicuous, had no succession

in the New Testament Church. It was the manward side of worship, that which appeared especially in the synagogue, with lay leaders, reading of Scriptures, short benedictions, voluntary speakers, the social fellowship of men and women, of old and young, not even excluding outsiders—this was the heritage that passed into Christian religious meetings. The Jewish mystics, the prophetic spirits, the still in the land, preachers like John the Baptist, the apocalyptic dreamers, the Essenes, were not readily drawn toward the more severe, didactic services of the synagogues; they rather sought retirement and chose the desert as the home of their devotion. It hardly seems, therefore, too much to say that it was the least emotional, the least prophetic, the least ecstatic form of the synagogue services which formed the antecedent of Christian worship. But with all formal likeness between synagogue and church, the spirit in each was so different that the Jew who was converted to Christ must have felt in the Christian meeting that old things had passed away and all things had become new. The edification of the synagogue rested upon a traditional and barren legalism; and this legalism was associated with a doctrine of the transcendence of Jehovah, which forgot the Lawgiver in the study of the law. God was so far away, that only by means of middle beings, of angels, the Memra, the Holy Spirit, could men get ideas concerning Him; and it was in some far-off Messianic age that real fellowship with Him was supposed to be possible. But the edification of the Christian meeting started at once from the nearness, the very presence of God among them. Christ was Immanuel; the gospel preached personal union with God in Christ. The far-off God was nigh, the infinite God finite, the invisible God visible in Jesus. The Jews at the Passover met about the empty chair of Elijah, the forerunner of the Messiah; the Christians at all their gatherings assembled about Christ really, gloriously among them. We have no description of the public worship of the Jewish Christians. The Apocalypse, however, gives a picture of the worship of the Redeemer in heaven, which may be regarded as an idealization of the services held by Jewish Christians (Rev. iv-vi). The worshiper was in the Spirit. The leader sat upon a throne surrounded by the elders, all being inspired by the sevenfold Spirit of God. The service began with benedictions to God; but the chief feature in it was the book in the hand of the leader, its opening by Christ, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and its exposition, which was not in words but in living beings, who went forth as living epistles to do the will of God. The central object of worship was the Lamb in the midst of the

assembly; and the new song of praise by the elders was unto Him who redeemed the saints unto God by His blood and made them kings and priests unto God; to which a multitude, thousands of thousands, responded, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain. . . . Blessing and honor and glory and power . . . be to Him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb for ever and ever." The outlook of all the worship—its revelation, its seals, its books, its symbolical figures—is the victory and glory of the Church and Christ. Jewish Christian worship seems never to have fallen into the excesses which Paul had to correct among Corinthian believers (1 Cor. xi-xiv). James shows, however (i-ii), that it was by no means free from defects. There were in it hearers of the Word who were not doers of it, who did not bridle their tongues, who were "judges with evil thoughts," because they put the rich man in a place of honor because of his gold ring and gay clothing, and set the poor brother in an obscure place on account of his poverty; there were those who claimed to have faith but whose works belied their claim, who had bitter envying and strife in their hearts; there was a desire of many to be teachers, and not a few who offended in the word of teaching. Lust, hatred, murder, adultery, friendship, of the world—nearly all that Jesus warned against in the Sermon on the Mount—James warns against as present in the Church. And his counsel, like that of Paul, is unto edification—to be rich in faith, not rich in goods; to be "swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath"; to "receive with meekness the engrafted Word"; to be "doers of the Word" and "doers of the work" of God; to be justified by works as well as by faith; to cherish heavenly wisdom, which makes men pure, peaceable, gentle, merciful and fruitful; and to fulfill the royal law of the Scriptures, which he sums up in its edifying character for man, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." These were the requisites to profitable worship as well as to godly living. His chief injunction respecting worship was: "My brethren, hold not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons." The edification of the poor brother was uppermost in his thoughts about services in what he calls the Christian "synagogue" (ii. 1-2).

For the heathen convert participation in Christian worship meant a much greater revolution in his attitude toward objects of worship, and a glorious enlargement of the joys of social devotion. When he accepted Christ the whole Godward side of his previous religion fell in ruins. Jupiter, Apollo, the Sun, Baal, Isis, Nemesis, Fate, whatever the names of his deities and heavenly powers, were

regarded as vanity and a lie, as belonging to the doctrine of devils; there was left, accordingly, for him at first as the only familiar element in worship human companionship, that religious confidence which came from fellowship with Christians and with the Christ in their midst. As the exorcist Jews cried, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth," so many a convert from the Gentiles might well say, "We believe in the God whom the Christians worship through Christ." Fellowship in a holy brotherhood was the first and vital thing in his piety and worship. Through brotherly kindness and charity he was to learn the deeper lessons of the faith. In the Gentile churches, the ignorance of the Old Testament, which Jesus fulfilled, and of its fundamental ideas about God, man and the Messianic hope, wou'd naturally make the teaching or edifying element even more prominent than in the Jewish churches. Every man must enter the New Testament by way of the Old. Paul and Peter and John ever presuppose it. But Gentile converts could not read the Hebrew Scriptures, and the Septuagint was not always easily procured; there was every reason, therefore, for giving large place to instruction in every meeting of Christians. In these gatherings, as among the first Jewish believers, the social element was strong. Meetings were held in houses and partook largely of a family character. Women were present, and took part in the *ἀγάπη* and ate with men at the Lord's Supper—things unknown outside Christian circles; slaves, also, could take part; all classes formed one household of faith. These circumstances and relations conspired to make the human aspect of worship peculiarly prominent, and to make edification its chief feature. In opposition to the Jewish traditional ritual and the superstitious, magical incantations and sacrifices of paganism, Paul calls this Christian devotion a *λογικὴ λατρεία*, a reasonable service (Rom. xii. 1). It claimed the intelligent attention of the worshiper, and was fulfilled according to the measure of his intelligence. Its reason for being was to supply the spiritual needs of man; and anything in it which did not minister to such needs had no place in New Testament worship. Köstlin finds three principles in this worship, viz.: (1) attachment to the traditions received from the first believers in Jesus, (2) that all should be done decently and in order, and (3) edification, of which it is evident the last is supreme. Good old customs, order and decency are involved in edification and could not live spiritually apart from it.

But the question may still arise: What was this edification of which the New Testament makes so much? Is it not self-evident

that apostolic worship, as well as all other apostolic activity, sought to promote Christianity? Does not every Christian think that his method of work and his form of devotion is best for its purpose? Is not the aim of Quaker and Lutheran, Greek Catholic and Roman Catholic, Salvation Army and Anglican the same? Elaborate ritual, eloquent preaching, rich music, social privileges, varied culture, revival services, ascetic devotion, cannot these all claim to be unto edification? These inquiries answer themselves, but they also lead to the further question: What was the character of the worship which the New Testament regarded as edifying? And what were the things connected with it which were distinctly declared to be unedifying? A reply will be found to this inquiry in a survey of the worship of the apostolic Church? It is called the Church of God, and the Church of Christ (1 Cor. x. 22; Gal. i. 13). In it are all treasures of knowledge and grace for the edification of its members (1 Cor. xii. 28). It was regarded as a community of priests offering itself in love and gratitude to God. It was a living temple, a living body, of which Christ was head. Under the law of growth, illustrated in Jesus' teachings about the vine and its branches, this worshiping congregation was regarded as abiding in Christ, receptive, passive; its praise, its testimony, its self-edification was an expression of the life of the present Lord. Only as the consciousness of one brother took in the needs of another, and intentionally shaped his spontaneous, charismatic contribution to the worship so as to meet those needs, did his part in devotion become of purpose edifying. The dominant thought was that of the whole body edifying itself in love, though the single believer was never forgotten as part of the whole. And beneath both spontaneous and intentional acts of worship was the ever-present Christ, speaking in the Word of God and breathing in every heart by His Spirit. The heart of edification, then, was the recognition of the Divine Lord in the midst of the worshiping assembly. This sense of one Lord led, also, to another element necessary to true edification: it produced unity. If brethren were to be built up they must be of one mind, for the Spirit of Christ was a spirit of unity and not of discord. This meant further that worshipers to be edified must agree in the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, such as repentance toward God, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and hope of eternal life. Paul urged the Corinthians to "all speak the same thing" (1 Cor. i. 10) and to be "perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." The meeting for worship should heal all heresies, for the "many" here were made "one bread and one

body," since all were "partakers of that one bread," even Christ (1 Cor. x. 17). Accordingly the Church in Rome was warned against those who "cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned," and told to "avoid them" (Rom. xvi. 17). John has similar teachings respecting agreement in belief; so have Peter, James and other New Testament writers.\* Order and decency in worship involved unity, and unity of devotion rested upon unity of faith. Jewish and Gentile Christians quarreling about circumcision, and Sabbath days, and new moons, and eating together, and heathen science, destroyed the harmony of Christian communion and made it unedifying; hence Paul did not hesitate to fight for peace, to denounce teachers of false divisive doctrines, and insist that his gospel came from the God of peace, through the Prince of peace, and alone led to peace in the churches. As already intimated, the cardinal doctrine in Paul's gospel was Jesus Christ and Him crucified as the only way of access to God. Christians were known as those who called in worship upon the name of Christ (Acts ix. 14, 21; 2 Tim. ii. 22; Rev. v. 8). This was as true among Jewish as among Gentile believers. In every place they called upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The mark of victory over Jewish narrowness and legalism was a recognition and worship of the Divine Christ. For this reason the apostolic men who have this triumph most in mind—John, Paul, the author of Hebrews—all regarded Christ as a being who came down from heaven. But even James defines a Christian as one who had "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory," and Peter urged believers to sanctify Jesus as "the Lord God in their hearts" (iii. 15). The earliest Christian hymns were hymns to Christ. The earliest Christian blasphemy was blasphemy of Christ. The earliest Christian baptism was in the name of Christ. It does not, then, seem too much to say that edifying praise, prayer and preaching in the apostolic Church rested upon faith in a present, divine Christ. It rested also upon belief in the personal Spirit of God, which was also the Spirit of Christ. There could be no edification in worship, no qualification to take part in worship without the Holy Spirit. The constant description of both working and worshiping Christians in the New Testament is "in the Lord," "helpers in Christ Jesus," "laboring much in the Lord," "in the Spirit." Each believer had a talent from the Lord, a *χάρισμα* from the Spirit, which he should use for the good of himself and others. So prominent is this feature that apostolic worship is often called charis-

\* Cf. 1 John ii. 19; iv. 1f.; James v. 19; 2 Peter ii. 1f.; Jude v. 3f.

matic. In it the leader or speaker was not a "mouth" or "organ" of the congregation, but rather a voice uttering the mind of the present Christ through the Spirit; he was a declarer and interpreter of the divine Word (1 Cor. xiv. 26). In such spiritual speaking Paul saw the worshiping congregation making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love (Eph. iv. 15). The only priestly factor was the holy brotherhood offering itself to Christ in its midst. All leaders, from apostles to the humblest brother with a gift, were but ministers of the grace of edification. In like manner the exclusion of the unworthy from the edification of worship took place by the whole assembly, led by the Spirit, and in the power of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. v. 4).

But this great spiritual liberty had its dangers; and Paul discusses at length charismatic disorders which threatened to rob worship of its edifying character. In his classic discussion of this subject (1 Cor. xii-xiv) he refers to three things in particular: first, women who had a gift taking part in public worship; second, treating the Lord's Supper as a social meal; and third, the preaching services of the church and the proper use of *χαρισματα* in them.\* The Church in Corinth gloried in its liberty, and Paul would not restrict it, for "where the Spirit of the Lord is" there must be liberty. His sole injunction is: "Let all things be done unto edifying." The action of women and treatment of the Lord's Supper were more external in their nature, a question of behavior; but the gifts of the Spirit and their use had to do with deep things of the soul. Here appeared prophecy, tongues, miracles, helps, healings, things which Paul valued very highly and rejoiced that he possessed in larger measure than most believers. But he tested them all by their power to edify. He had rather speak five words of intelligible instruction than produce a second Day of Pentecost for the amazement of the multitude. He begins his exhortation upon spiritual gifts (1 Cor. xiv. 1) with the words: "Follow after charity"; that is the royal way, upon which tongues and miracles are but local incidents. He says: "I would that ye all spake with tongues," then adds, "but rather that ye prophesied," for prophecy which gave revelation and knowledge edified. He put prophecy first among spiritual gifts, because "he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification and exhortation and comfort"; he "edifieth the Church" (1 Cor. xiv. 3, 4). The man with tongues spake unto God, but such ecstasy toward God was but as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal compared with the sure word of prophecy which

\* See Godet's Commentary on 1 Cor. xii-xiv.

was as the clear note of a trumpet calling to battle. When the simple worshiper could not say the "amen" at the close of a prayer, because he did not understand it, he was for the time put out of Christian fellowship; and the exercise of gifts in religious services at which most of those present could only wonder and be amazed turned the worshiping congregation into a theatrical assembly, beholding a spectacle instead of being edified in faith, hope and love. Here lay the germ of the Greek Catholic mass, which took form along the lines of the classic drama. On the other hand, intelligible worship, shared in by all the people, not only edified the feeblest saint, but converted the unbeliever by leading him to self-examination and conviction of the presence of God. Hearing men speak with tongues would provoke the visitor to say: "You are crazy," but prophecy, rational setting forth of truth, would cause him to exclaim: "God is among you of a truth" (1 Cor. xiv. 26f.).

The elements of Christian worship are summed up by Paul in a psalm, a doctrine, a tongue, a revelation and an interpretation of the revelation. And the principle upon which these were to be employed was: "Let all things be done unto edifying" (1 Cor. xiv. 26). The service began apparently with singing, accompanied probably by benedictions. One had a psalm because the Spirit granted him the gift to select it from the Scriptures, or compose it himself, or lead the singing. Chief stress was laid upon the thought and its rhetorical and rhythmical expression, rather than upon the melody. The simple intoning was more a matter of elocution than music. The man with a psalm was to set forth truth, so as to help the hearer. He was not to entertain or surprise or exhibit himself. Paul's demand of the singer and his song is that they edify. He says: "I will sing with the understanding also," where the statement is parallel with the words: "I will pray in the spirit." The psalm was a prayer, and should glorify God as it helped edify man. Singing with the understanding for Paul meant, above all else, praising Christ as Saviour and Lord. When his theology blossoms into song that is its theme. Doubtless the Messianic psalms formed a large part of such praise. The second psalm, about the Lord saying "Thou art my Son. . . . Blessed are all they that put their trust in him," is quoted in the New Testament oftener than any other Old Testament passage. When the persecuted disciples, Peter and John, returned to their own company, all burst forth singing this psalm. Stephen closed his sermon quoting it, and then looked into heaven to see Jesus and cry, "Lord

Jesus, receive my spirit." Pliny says the Church, at the close of the apostolic century, sang *carmen Christo quasi Deo*.

After this edifying psalm came teaching, *διδαχή*. This was the word of knowledge, which was also given by the Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 8). Paul calls it elsewhere a *λόγος γνώσεως* and a *λόγος σοφίας*. Köstlin thinks\* the first referred to the theological character of the teaching, and the second to its philosophic or artistic form of expression (S. 16). Weizsäcker thinks the word of wisdom meant especially God's revelation in the universe, while the word of knowledge meant the vision of God in Christ within us. In any case, such teaching was rational, and rested upon knowledge (1 Cor. xiv. 6). There was another kind of preaching, called prophecy, which rested upon revelation. This appealed more to the emotions, while the word of knowledge sought to enlighten the mind and convince the will. But whether the teacher reasoned or the prophet exhorted, each was guided by the self-same spirit. The prophet uttered what the Spirit gave him by sudden inspiration; the teacher unfolded what the Spirit showed him by means of study. Paul's own preaching, which he considered most edifying, was of the didactic order. He describes it (Acts xx. 20) first as an *ἀπαρτίλλειν*, that is a showing forth, an explaining the Gospel; second, as *διδάξαι*, or teaching, and third, as a *διαμαρτυρόμενος*, a testifying to the truth and an appeal to men to share his Christian experience. He distinguished, further, two grades of edifying preaching, one being elementary, or milk for babes, the other being wisdom, meat for men, the deeper doctrinal truths which are involved in the Gospel (1 Cor. iii. 2). In Heb. vi. 1-3, also, this distinction is made and the exposition of the high priesthood of Christ from Ps. cx referred to as such strong meat. It is toward this higher intellectual edification that Paul urges Christians to grow. They should be children in nothing but malice; in understanding Christian truth they should be men. An article in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for 1899, setting forth Paul's own account of his preaching, sums it up in the following points: (1) Its subject matter came from God and not from men; this divine wisdom was revealed only to those who love God, and centres in Christ crucified; (2) only the Holy Spirit can qualify the preacher to set forth this wisdom in Christ and edify the people; (3) the delivery of the preacher, his words and style, as well as his exegesis, depend upon the Spirit, for he spoke "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth" (1 Cor. ii. 13); (4) and the edifying effect of

\* *Geschichte des Christ. Gottesdienstes*, 1887.

such preaching was conviction of the *ἀπίστως* or the *ἰδιωτής*, his self-condemnation, revelation of the hidden things of his heart, confession of sin and surrender to God. Paul's preaching also included practical instruction for Christian living. He praised the Corinthians for keeping the traditions which he gave them (1 Cor. xi. 2), and directed Timothy to remind them of "my ways which be in Christ," and those rules of life which, he says, he taught everywhere in every Church (1 Cor. iv. 17).

After the psalm and the preaching of knowledge, Paul refers to prophecy and the speaking with tongues which followed it. These formed an exhortative and ecstatic outgrowth of the word of wisdom. As prophetic men mused upon it the fire burned, and tongues of flame declared the mind of God. The prophet feeling the Word of God burning for utterance rose to his feet to utter it as the assembly were accustomed to rise to hear the same Word from the Scriptures. The Spirit of Christ within him dominated all else; hence Paul declares it a test of the true prophet that in his most ecstatic exclamations he should cry "Jesus Lord" (1 Cor. xii. 3). The prophet was conscious of what he said and heard in the Spirit; and in this consciousness Paul put the edifying nature of what he said. He could communicate intelligibly a message from God for the profit of them that heard (1 Cor. xiv. 3). And he was to exercise his prophetic gift only unto edification. Women prophets, who might naturally fall into excess of ecstasy and uncover their heads like men, were not allowed to speak in public meetings. It was not seemly, not edifying. Not more than three prophets were to speak at the same meeting; more would not be profitable. When a second prophet was moved to speak, the first must cease; the fresh spiritual impulse of the second prophet might be more edifying than the extended exhortation of the first. Finally, when all the prophets had spoken, "the others" present, all the brotherhood, were to judge what had been said and test it by reason, analogy of the faith,\* the Scriptures and their own experience of the Spirit of Jesus. Discerning and testing these prophetic spirits was a gift of God as much as prophecy itself (1 Cor. xii. 10). After the prophet who heard the voice of God but addressed himself to men came the speaker with tongues who heard and addressed God alone. For such a man, however inspired, Paul had really no place in public worship. He had reached the extreme of religious emotion and the minimum of profit for any save himself; hence Paul's discouragement of him. He would not

\* Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 10.

exchange one hour of rational preaching for all the spiritualistic seances known from the witch of Endor to the present day. He limited such speakers, as he did the prophets, to not more than three at one service. He also directed that interpretation of tongues follow, so as to bring any truth uttered in this fine frenzy within the sphere of edification. If there were no interpreter the man with a tongue must keep silence in the church. Even a lying spirit might take possession of him, so that he must never speak save in the presence of a discerner of spirits. This severe limitation of speaking with tongues is very remarkable, when we consider, on the one hand, the high place given poetic and philosophical "madness," as Plato calls it, among the Greeks, and the great honor which Paul ascribes to it as a spiritual gift which had been bestowed in high degree upon himself. The God-intoxicated man was for the time being irresponsible; the more he honored God the less he listened to reason; the end might be disorder and indecency. For this reason Paul checked this tendency. It was not unto edification. From this point of view he was led to discuss the question of spiritual gifts at length (1 Cor. xiv. 1-28). He does not discuss the gift of tongues at all as such; he refers to it only as something that came in the way of edification in worship. Every "manifestation of the Spirit is given," he says, "to every man to profit withal." Anything that infringes this principle must be checked by the reason of the prophet; and if it got beyond the control of the prophet, Paul told "the others" to stop it, "for God is not the author of confusion but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." Thus the circuit of public speaking in apostolic worship began and ended with teaching unto edification; for the quiet, rational interpretation of tongues with which it closed was essentially the same as the *διδασκή* with which it opened. In the later apostolic period, when charismatic men began to disappear and worship took on more regular forms, prophecy blended with teaching and speaking with tongues became identified with the psalm. The last great factor in apostolic worship was prayer. It may be said also to have opened the services, for words of benediction and the psalm were of that character. The summary of Christian characteristics given in Acts ii. 42 consists of the teaching of the apostles, fellowship, breaking of bread and the prayers, in which the frequent, brief thanksgiving prayers of praise and blessing seem especially referred to. Paul connects prayer especially with singing, as if its chief feature were praise. True public prayer, like every other part of worship, must edify. It must not be in an unknown tongue, it

must be with the understanding, it must be such that all who hear it can intelligently and from the heart say "the amen" to it. Of the prayers so common elsewhere, of the adoring, meditative, bartering, moralizing, transcendental, preaching, indirect character we find little evidence in New Testament worship. When these prayers turned from thanksgiving to petitions their desires were for the spread of the gospel (Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 8), for boldness to preach the Gospel (Acts iv. 29), they were on behalf of other Christians (1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1), for erring brethren (James v. 16), for the civil rulers (1 Tim. ii. 1), and for all men. The limits of this paper will not permit us to consider other parts of early worship in which the same edifying principle appears. In every service an offering was brought, of bread and wine, of money and other good things. These offerings were analogous to the sacrifices and first fruits brought into the temple; but now they all looked toward the good of the assembled people. They were presented to God in Christ, and then given to the poor, the widows, the sick; they were for Christian workers and for the support of the Church. Baptism also and the Lord's Supper, the two New Testament sacraments, like the Sabbath, were for man, and not man for them. They were to edify the Church. They had no mystical, sacerdotal character.

Baptism looks everywhere toward such edification as we have been considering. It introduced Jesus to His work, which was to fulfill all righteousness. He called his service and his sufferings for men a baptism (Matt. xx. 22; Luke xii. 50). For a season in the early ministry of our Lord His disciples baptized their converts (John iv. 1); but this practice seems to have led to premature and wrong conceptions of the Messianic kingdom; baptism became unedifying and was abandoned. Jesus led His disciples aside from mission work to instruct them in the deeper things of the kingdom; baptism was postponed because it really rested upon Christ's death and resurrection, and was not to be resumed till these had taken place. At the close of Christ's ministry baptism was commanded again as an ordinance for missionary service. It now as ever had in view those who believed, who were converted, and who were ready to learn all things whatsoever Jesus had commanded His disciples. Its practice was resumed after Pentecost, for the great outpouring of the Spirit there produced that faith and holiness for which baptism stood and called for the external sign of these things. Baptism always signified the work of the Holy Ghost in man's life through regeneration, faith and good works. It took place

upon personal confession of faith, and in the case of children rested upon the parents' confession and the promise of Christian nurture. There was nothing magical, ecclesiastical, mysterious or sacerdotal about it. It did not induce God to be gracious; it did not in some *ex opere operato* sense convey spiritual benefit; it did not initiate into religious mysteries. Any believer might see it administered; it might be observed on any day, in any place, in any manner. Strictly speaking, the convert baptized himself. The *A:ðaxi*, in the second century, still reflects this early edifying usage. It teaches that baptism might be by immersion or pouring, in running water, in ponds or in cisterns. It is referred to in general as administered in the name of Christ, and more specifically as in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Nothing could more exalt the central position of the divine Christ in baptism than such alternate expressions in which He alone is put beside Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Baptism Paul describes as especially referring to the death of Christ (Rom. vi. 3), which brought redemption, and to participation in the resurrection of Christ, which was the ground of all holy living. He had no idea that it wrought regeneration, or that it was a priestly ordinance in itself pleasing to God. As compared with preaching the Gospel he regarded it as of minor importance; so much so that he rarely baptized any convert, saying "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17). It followed, and did not precede, the gift of the Holy Ghost; hence when Peter saw that Cornelius and his company had received the Spirit he commanded them to be baptized. Paul speaks of the washing away of sins in his own baptism; but it is evident he uses the words to describe justification by faith which expressed itself in calling upon the name of the Lord (cf. Heb. x. 22). The New Testament regards baptism as analogous to circumcision, which Paul said was of chief value because it carried with it instruction in the oracles of God; it was a pledge of Christian nurture. He here followed the thought of Jesus, who taught that baptism, to be effective, should be followed by instruction in all things whatsoever He had commanded. Like prayer, the Scriptures and the Sabbath, baptism was a means of grace ordained by God for the edification of the Church. The body washed with pure water availed nothing unless it was preceded by the heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, and the heart could attain this sprinkling with atoning blood only as the believer came with a true heart in full assurance of faith (Heb. xi. 22).

The other New Testament sacrament, that of the Lord's Supper,

should be approached from the same point of view; it was to edify the Church. Luther called it a "visible word" of God; and it is a means of grace like the Scriptures. Here also the meeting of believers was in a brotherly, passive, receptive attitude. Partaking of the Lord's Supper was compared with eating the Jewish sacrifices and sharing the Passover supper (1 Cor. x. 14-22; v. 7). Gratitude was the dominant note in this service, and the prayer of thanksgiving was the consecrating factor in the Eucharist. The later Romish conception, that the words "Hoc enim est corpus meum" constituted the Supper, is quite foreign to the New Testament. "Prayers of thanksgiving and songs of praise surrounded this holy ordinance" (Köstlin). It is described as εὐλογεῖν, εὐχαριστεῖν, ὑμνεῖν (Matt. xxvi. 26 f.) and λατεῖν (Acts ii. 47). And the object of all this praise and thanksgiving and blessing was Christ the Lord, whose body was broken to take away sin and whose blood was the seal of the new covenant of grace. The view of Zwingli, that the Supper is a memorial of the death of Christ, and the teaching of Calvin, that the glorified Christ was spiritually present in it, doubtless present two sides of the apostolic conception. As commemorating the sufferings of Jesus it had an objective outlook toward the cross; but even in this direction Paul sees believers crucified together with Christ, while in the holy bread of the Supper he sees now Christ Himself and again the Church (1 Cor. x 17; xi. 27). This nearness of the Lord and His saving work in the Supper is seen especially in the identification of the wine with the blood shed for the remission of sins. The Christ of the Last Supper and the ever-living Christ so blended with Christ upon the cross that His death was swallowed up in victory. Christ the bread of life feeding believers through all the wilderness of this world is John's interpretation of the Lord's Supper (John vi. 32f.); just as we might say the Lord's washing the disciples' feet to teach the true spirit of service was his conception of baptism. The outlook of the Supper which reminded of death was ever toward life, toward eating and drinking in the kingdom of the Father. It was preceded by a love feast which celebrated Christ in the midst, and looked forward to a heavenly love feast at which Jesus would again be visibly present. For a little while only was the Lord of the feast absent; He would speedily return; He was in the midst of the meeting by His Spirit; hence the edifying sense of Christ as the bread that gives strength, the wine that gives joy, the living, loving Lord, was strong in the heart of every communicant.

Many of the associations and suggestions of our modern celebra-

tion of the Lord's Supper lead away from the simple, social, charismatic, edifying observation of it in apostolic days. We celebrate it in the morning, by daylight, which is out of all connection with its origin at suppertime with lighted lamps. Now it is added to a preaching service; then it was joined to a brotherly meal. Now it is encumbered with admission of members, a confession of faith and baptismal observances; then it was a joyful celebration with no thought of the admission of outsiders. Now it is partaken of somewhat formally and while sitting up; then it was eaten unconventionally and lying down. Now we use leavened bread; then unleavened was used. Now we drink often unfermented wine, specially prepared and preserved, or pure wine; then the common fermented wine of the peasantry mixed with water was drunk. Now some one member or officer of the Church provides the bread and wine; then the Lord's table was furnished from gifts brought by the whole congregation. In those days Christians kissed one another as a sign of brotherhood in Christ before partaking of the Lord's Supper; now some Christians will not let others come to the table at all because they differ about clerical claims or modes of baptism, much less kiss them when they come. Then any brother might offer the prayer of thanksgiving and distribute the elements; now ordained men, priests or presbyters, and officials are required for this service. Then a full meal might be eaten; now a morsel is taken symbolically. Then the Lord's Supper was celebrated every week, if not every day; now it takes place much more seldom. This holy Supper had various forerunners which may help explain it. The Essenes among the Jews had a common table, at which every meal of the brotherhood was regarded as sacramental. The priests during their courses in the Temple ate at a common table, with prayers and thanksgivings. Jesus and the twelve long ate together, when every supper was in a sense the Lord's Supper. The Passover, a family, social supper it was at which Jesus instituted His holy Supper of covenant and remembrance. In the heathen world, also, eating together was always associated with religion; and in the Greek and Roman religious societies the brotherly meal was central and sacramental. All these surroundings naturally gave the Lord's Supper a familiar, brotherly character, in which the promotion of love, fellowship and mutual helpfulness among Christians was a prominent aim. It was just because of these things that the abuses which Paul set himself to correct were possible. They sprang from an excess of the social element which beclouded the consciousness that Christ was present, and that each

communicant should discern the body of the Lord in the bread, and discern himself as a sinner washed in the blood of Christ. It would be difficult to think of the Lord's Supper as now observed in a Catholic or Episcopalian or even Presbyterian or Congregational Church degenerating into an indoor picnic, with family groups eating bread and drinking wine out of their own baskets, as was the case in Corinth. Paul develops the teachings of Jesus about the Supper. It was, on the one hand, a memorial service, setting forth the new covenant in Christ's blood (Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxii. 20); and it signified a feeding by faith upon Christ as the Bread of life (John vi. 32ff.). Its great design was to edify the saints. The discourse of Jesus at the Supper was upon Himself as the Vine, the Way, the Life, upon the coming Spirit, victory over the world and the heavenly glory. The teachings of Paul held up the picture of the Last Supper that the brethren in Corinth might see by contrast how unedifying was their service. They forgot the glory and honor and reverence due the crucified and risen Lord, and thereby fell into discord and confusion. They were divided into factions; they became gluttonous and drunken at a service which by its observance at one time and one place stood for a sign of the unity of the Holy Ghost. There was a threefold sin in such things: (1) they ate as if it was a meal to satisfy hunger, overlooking the spiritual meaning of it; for this reason Paul would separate the *αγάπη* from the Supper of the Lord and insisted that the whole service should centre in Christ's atoning death. (2) There was a lack of respect for the meeting of the Church as a holy assembly. To eat and drink in it as in their own houses not only dishonored the Lord's Supper, but despised the Church of God. And (3) such abuse of the Supper gave special offense to the poor brother who came perhaps late and found no provision made for him. He was humiliated before all, and the whole Church insulted in its poor member. Paul's teaching upon the Lord's Supper culminates at the same place as did his teachings upon general worship, at the place of *στροδομή*. In both cases, whether it were speaking in unknown tongues or eating and drinking apart, the result was the practical excommunication of the ignorant and poor brother from the fellowship of the Church: and that for Paul was the place where reform must begin, because that was the place where edification ceased.

We approached our consideration of edification in worship by some notice of edification in Christian life and work; it seems fitting that we close our study with a brief reference to the New Testament doctrine that true worship and holy living are identical. Paul

speaks of the coming together of Christians for public worship; James presupposes a stated assembly of believers in what he calls "your synagogue"; and the writer of Hebrews urges the Brethren not to forsake the assembling of themselves together for social worship (x. 25). The public exercises of God's house were greatly honored; yet all these representatives of Jewish and Gentile Christianity agree in the thought that worship outside the meeting-house was just as important as that within it, and that no temple was so holy to God as the body of the true believer. This is a favorite idea of Paul's; and he repeatedly describes Christians as temples of God (Acts vii. 48; 1 Cor. iii. 17), of Christ (Gal. ii. 20), and of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. vi. 19). As Jesus spoke of the temple of His body (John ii. 19), so might believers speak. Peter also makes prominent the thought that every Christian is a "living stone" which is built into a "spiritual house," in which by holy living "spiritual sacrifices" are offered "acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Peter ii. 5). In Paul's use of the striking phrase *λογικὴ λατρεία* (Rom. xii. 1) he applies this "reasonable worship" of God to the presenting of our "bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God." This statement is the more striking because it opens the edifying or practical part of the epistle. All his letters have a doctrinal section, but this ever looked toward the edification which was to grow out of the doctrines, and which he set forth in the exhortations that close his writings. For Paul the worship of going to church, reading and hearing the Scriptures, the psalm, the teaching, the prophecy, the tongues, the interpretation, the prayers and benedictions, was but as altar stairs leading up to the higher worship of being transformed by the renewing of our minds, so that in living experience we may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. In cherishing holy thoughts that keep us in fellowship with a holy God, in opposing every deadly thing in motive or action that checks living communion with the living God, and in cultivating a heavenlymindedness which keeps us ever well-pleasing in the sight of God—that is, in Paul's estimation, preëminently reasonable worship, because that is the true, happy, holy and natural relation of man's whole being to the will of God. It is Paradise restored. In such a state, with man's very body, once the seat of sin, a temple of God, with faith, hope and love abiding supreme, all else vanishes from sight—prophecies, tongues, knowledge, churches, Bibles, liturgies, sacraments, pulpits, preachers—for every redeemed man is a shrine, every open heart a Bible, every enlightened conscience a dwelling-

place of the Spirit, every boundless hope a psalm, every joyful emotion a benediction, every reasonable conviction a teaching, every promise of faith a prophecy, every unutterable delight a gift of tongues, and every good deed an oblation to the Lord.

James looks upon this worship in living as a loving service for the good of our fellow-men, springing from a holy heart. He writes: "Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (i. 27). His words might also be rendered: "Pure worship of God and undefiled . . . is this," etc. Instead of being under Judaistic influences and lacking in apprehension of Christian liberty, as is sometimes held, James shows himself here a true disciple of Jesus. What did it mean for him to do things in remembrance of Christ? What things were meant? What was the true religion that would save men at the judgment seat of Christ? Jesus answered (Matt. xxv. 35 ff.), that it was feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, clothing the naked, visiting the sick and those in prison, for the love of Christ. That was the pure religion before God, the spiritual worship of the Father that James learned from Jesus. Nothing more sacramental could be done at the Lord's Supper in remembrance of Him than such deeds of kindness to the fatherless, the poor and the prisoner; "for inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me," said the Lord. Here was worship not in remembrance of Christ but worship of Christ; not figurative but real; not bringing gifts to the glorified Lord, who did not need them and could not accept them, but bestowing them upon his least brethren who needed them most, and through whom joy and gladness could come to Christ. Jesus is the incarnation of the love, the helpfulness, the beneficence of God; hence to reflect His spirit of holiness and helpfulness before God, as ever in His sight, seeing the needs of men as Jesus beheld them, and worshiping God by going about doing good, as the Lord showed us the way—that is pure religion and includes what is commonly called worship as one of its elements. Here James touches two points which are sometimes set in conflict in modern religious thought, viz., social reforms, practical philanthropic work, on the one hand, and personal holiness, with separation from the world, on the other. What keeps these in religious unity is the principle of edifying worship, the thought that every deed of kindness is done "before our God and Father" in heaven and in the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ (James i. 27–ii. 1). Mere edification of men might mean

nothing but ethical culture; formal worship of God might neglect the physical, social, economic needs of men: what brings these into the vital union of pure religion is edification in worship, charity before our Father in heaven, whether we eat or drink or whatsoever we do, doing all to the glory of God. The rights of man which philanthropy preaches will never be assured until men recognize their duty toward God. Ethics rests upon religion, work upon worship, usefulness upon devotion; in like manner personal, individual salvation from God in Christ must show itself in better family life, purer communities and the elevation of all social and national life. Christ is Head of the Church. Christ is Ruler of the nations. Against the very heart of the Gospel lies the all-embracing thought of *όπιζοδομή*.

*Chicago Theological Seminary.*

HUGH M. SCOTT.

### III.

#### MOSAISM AND DARWINISM.

**I**N the cases of both Moses and Darwin the known history and conditions of the men are our guarantee for the authenticity of their reputed writings. The Darwinian *Origin of Species* could not have been written by Lamarek, nor by anybody in Lamarck's time, nor even by a recent writer unless he possessed leisure and opportunities in the way of books and the help of competent friends, and also the personal field-experience as well as mental qualities of Charles Darwin. It has been long felt that the Pentateuch could not have been composed without some similar equipment, and for long time the assumption that Moses and Israel belonged to an unlettered environment was a difficulty. Recent progress in Egyptology and Assyriology has turned this argument, so that we now know that it could have been written by Moses, and is, in fact, the cream of the old history; also that it could not have been written in later times. This has been well shown by Sayce and others.

Moses seems to have been quite as industrious as Darwin in making the best use of the materials at his disposal. The great work which he was preparing on Israel is prefaced by a brief introductory sketch of the world's origines, which, though mere fragments, is the most fascinating and instructive bit of its size that has ever appeared. Here is found the chief difference between him and Darwin. The modern man of science, Darwin, explains nearly everything by a single materialistic theory which he calls "natural selection," a very good idea when properly used, but it runs wild in his hands; he is so naturalistic in his ideas that, after confessing his preference for the doctrine that the Creator had operated by secondary causes, he carries out this idea so as apparently to forget the existence of a Creator or Governor of the world. He disavowed any desire to write against religion, and we certainly would not charge him or his view with being anti-religious; he was only non-religious. Such a principle as he applied is sometimes useful in science, compelling men to search deep for natural causation, but it is partial and misses the better part of the treasure. In contrast with this Moses is so full of his theism, as to history and as to moral

issues and as to the divine origin of all, that he rarely emphasizes physicalities, and with him every event seems to come directly from God. The few physical notes which he gives are, when allowance is made for accommodation to the style and limitations of his age, singularly free from error and from exaggeration, and in this respect they contrast with Babylonian and Egyptian and also with Darwinian methods.

This singular inerrancy, which is now becoming obvious since we have got hold of some of the productions of the time and are able to make comparisons, may be accounted for chiefly by the fact that Moses sought and obtained divine help; and this more particularly for the religious elements of his writings. We are also disposed to give him credit for the scholarly grace of distinguishing between knowledge and opinions, and for not writing down as known what he did not know. Another feature of his works appeals to us. Whilst he opens on us a flood of miracles at the time of the Exodus, he is very chary of these on other occasions. Readers of his antediluvian sketches may, if they please, supplement his statements by assumed or imaginary miracles; and the supernatural is always present in his narrative, but he has not acquired the miracle-mongering habit. We think that in this matter one part of his work should help the other; the man who is not wont to be crying miracle on every turn may well gain our attention when he does use the word. His work is so manifestly and simply historical that we are reminded by it of what Prof. William M. Ramsay says of St. Luke's narrative of *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*. After exhibiting the marvelous accuracy of the record, Ramsay adds the remark that there is no reason to reject a particular incident mentioned "save that it introduces the superhuman element"; on this he declines to offer an opinion, except to say that "the superhuman element is inextricably involved in this book; you cannot cut it out by any critical process that will bear scrutiny. You must accept all or leave all." That argument is, we think, as applicable to Moses as to Luke; and recent discoveries are tending to demonstrate that we cannot get out of the difficulty by the easy method of "leaving all."

Our ignorance of the social conditions of the antediluvians render it easy whenever we are baffled to raise an issue of historical veracity. Such a course, however, is not legitimate, unless we have some direct evidence to that effect; and it is excluded in the present case by the patent fact that Moses was not credulous, but that he carefully weeded out the grossness of the tabletizers and

cosmogonists and theogonists of ancient times. He merely touches upon the primitiae of religious and secular knowledge, and his testimony, so far as it goes, is deserving of respect. This was clearly the opinion of our Saviour and of the New Testament writers, though they were independent in their use of the Old Testament. If the writings of Moses are sometimes picturesque, or even grotesque, this is a matter of literary taste, and not of errancy.

Darwinism naturally advanced no claim to special authority, though some of its advocates at one time seemed ready to proclaim its infallibility. Its best service was that it opened the way through much groping and guessing to valuable discoveries. We are now coming to a partial synthesis of its results with Mosaism, not for the purpose of interfering with religious or scientific liberty, but for helping us to comprehend the divine method of creation and providence.

### 1. THE COSMOGONY.

Before the Darwinian era the problem of creation was even more difficult than it is now, for there are certain questions which Darwin has settled. Thus nobody now argues that the different races of mankind cannot have come from a common stock; though some make the lines of separation sharper than do others. Pye Smith's *Scripture and Geology*, published in 1840, gives a graphic sketch of the struggle at that date. In 1855, four years prior to the publication of Darwin's book, I had to study the question, with the aid of Eadie's *Biblical Cyclopædia*, which is still beside me. Then I learned that the world is much older than we had imagined; and I was taught to make room for its longevity by interjecting long geological periods anterior to the six creative days of Genesis. Next came Hugh Miller's beautiful poem on *The Testimony of the Rocks*, which we may admire and love even when we cannot coincide in its chief points. Another curiosity was Philip Henry Gosse's *Omphalos*, the work of a man with a true scientific spirit, and a true Christian; but the book was all wrong; it was little better than the dogma which we have often heard enunciated by learned men, who were simpletons in the scientific way, that God had in a moment of time, or at most in a natural week, created the earth, fossils and all, just as we find them; and a capital exercise His works would afford for exercising the wits of the curious. Of course such a view is a possibility, but it cannot be proved, and no sensible man would accept it without proof. Next, my dear friend Prof. James Murphy, of Belfast, took the case in hand for his valuable *Commentary on Genesis*; he came in his advanced years to a place beside us young-

sters in Wyville Thompson's Class of Geology, so that he might do justice to the scientific side of the question. He arrived ultimately at the same scheme that Pye Smith had promulgated a quarter of a century earlier; by localizing the Genesiac narrative he evaded wider questions, and was not required to commit himself to a general scheme of conciliation. That view is certainly tenable, and has the recommendation that it makes Moses confine himself to his proper subject, which was religious; in his exposition of the subject, Murphy's *Commentary* has not, so far as we know, been surpassed. Recent discoveries seem to indicate, however, that Moses took a broader view even of the physical side of the case; and if we fail to follow him, we shall lose some interesting illustrations of his method and aim.

It was at this juncture that Darwin's book cast a new light on the question; but, so far as we know, it did not add in any way to its difficulty. Dana's theory, and afterward that of Guyot, the first copy of whose book reached its author on his death-bed, gave a comprehensive view by presenting the Mosaic narrative as embodying a cosmical nebular theory, as well as at a later period a series of geological ages, all broadly sketched. Whilst we have no means of deciding between some of the methods indicated, we certainly think that Guyot's was one of the best, and it was reached after long and careful study. We have only to remark on the attempts to correlate the events of Geology with the narrative of the six days, that we think the creation of vegetation ought not to be referred to the Carboniferous age, as it is possible that there was abundant sunshine in that age, and in its Silurian predecessor. In the still earlier ages, before the time of trilobites and of trees with annual rings, there are evidences of abundant vegetation of low type; and, as Guyot remarks, the method in Genesis is to record the beginning of each style of life, and then not to notice that again, though it may overflow into later periods. Thus, vegetation was started on the third day, before bright sunshine was visible. It may be observed that the diversity of modes of conciliation is no objection to the truth of a narrative, but helpful. It rarely occurs that in remote subjects of this kind we are able precisely to parallel the incidents; and it is a gain to find that a contradiction is unprovable, and that there are several modes in which independent records may be found to run in harmony. It is true that some writers condemn all efforts of the harmonizers; but this condemnation usually comes from writers who have a pet scheme of their own, or who would prefer to see contradiction. If we felt ourselves compelled

to attempt a comparison, we should prefer not to fix a rigorous meaning to any of the "days"; but rather to regard them as rhetorical marks, much as we use such metaphors as chapter, section, verse, or as the geologists say, period, age, bed, and so on. The paucity of words often compels us to use them in ways that would puzzle the uninitiated, and we should like to hear from some Egyptologist about the *usus loquendi* in those times as to the word *day* in its various applications.

Everything in the Mosaic narrative seems to us to claim a favorable exegesis. Terseness, brevity, absolute freedom from the ineptiae and absurdities of Egyptian and Babylonian records, no ingenious speculations such as sadly disfigure Darwin's otherwise splendid work, and first to last the aim to do good, to show men that God is merciful even to sinners—these elements account for the strange fascination that renders the beginning of Genesis at once the most puzzling and the most interesting book in existence.

The charge that the narrative has omissions or is often vague is proof that the critic has not mastered the rules of his art. The best witnesses are open to such charges, and the critic's business is to put the fragments together and to search out the real meaning. There is no vagueness as to the monotheism, or as to the divine government over all the creatures and all their actions; even the earliest and most condensed part of the Bible is clear and singularly full on this.

We admit that it would be a serious charge if somebody could show that Moses endeavored to give a narrative of the order of creation, and that he went wrong in the attempt. This would prove not only errancy, but bad judgment. Such a charge has been laid against our Saviour because He said that a grain of wheat dies in bearing the young plant; an absurd charge in this case, for without any inspiration our Saviour's rural hearers all knew that it dies, as botanists now generally acknowledge. That neither the Saviour nor His hearers had any idea of spontaneous generation about wheat, as has been alleged against Him, is clearly shown by His statement on another occasion that while the sower sleeps "it groweth, he knoweth not how." That statement of His is quite true, and it is not spontaneous generation. The excellency of the Bible writers, from Moses to Jesus and to John, is that they do not make blunders about common things; if ever something occurred that puzzled them they either declared that they knew it not, or else they were silent regarding it. In this the Bible writers are models for us; as even in this age of much learning we all say and

write about many things beyond our knowledge. We admit that guessing is often defensible, but the bad point is that we put down guesses as if they were knowledge. However it happened that the writers of Scripture were enabled to follow a better method, they are, at any rate, wonderfully apt in avoiding the popular errors of their time.

The Scripture sometimes disavows giving a complete narrative, and if there were evolution connected with the origin of man, this is not hinted at in the Mosaic account, possibly for the sufficient reason that it had not been revealed to Moses. He grasped the great matters and left the trifles for others; and how successful he was, even as judged by an unfriendly critic, we see from Ernest Haeckel's tribute, one of the many instances in which infidelity shows that it can carry a conscience. Haeckel's *History of Creation* says of the opening chapter of the Book of Genesis:—"Its extraordinary success is explained not only by its close connection with Jewish and Christian doctrines, but also by the simple and natural chain of ideas which runs through it, and which contrasts favorably with the confused mythology of creation current among most of the other ancient nations. First the Lord God creates the earth as an inorganic body; then He separates light from darkness, then water from dry land. Now the earth has become habitable for organisms, and plants are first created, animals later, and among the latter the inhabitants of the water and the air first, and afterward the inhabitants of the dry land. Finally God creates man, the last of all organisms, in His own image, and as the ruler of the earth.

"Two great and fundamental ideas," continues Haeckel, "common also to the non-miraculous theory of development, meet us in this Mosaic hypothesis of creation with surprising clearness and simplicity, the idea of separation or *differentiation*, and the idea of progressive development or *perfecting*. . . . In his theory there lies hidden the ruling idea of a progressive development and a differentiation of the originally simple matter. We can therefore bestow our just and sincere admiration on the Jewish lawgiver's grand insight into nature, and his simple and natural hypothesis of creation, without discovering in it a so-called divine revelation."

We would not for a moment detract from this well-deserved tribute by suggesting that Moses' inspiration left no room for the play of his own genius and industry. But Haeckel rather spoils the compliment by objecting against Moses (1) his geocentric error, and

\* Appleton's Edition (1876), Vol. I, pp. 37-38.

(2) his anthropocentric error; objections which, in our opinion, demonstrate the limitations of the critic himself. Even if Moses had known the Copernican system, which we are confident he did not, he should have been very unwise to drag in a matter which set the world on fire even in an age of learning, which could only have bewildered the Hebrews, and which in our own day bewilders some German divines. His anthropocentric view was no error, but was deliberately taken in the line of duty, for that was his function, to teach men about their relation to God. A good physician must be exceedingly anthropocentric as to his reading, his investigations, and his thoughts and aims.

The late George Romanes, writing in the editorial columns of *Nature*, in August, 1881, was much impressed by the scientific spirit of what he termed "the grand old legend" of Gen. i. His subsequent conversion and his book in defense of the Bible give force to his earlier remarks, and show that in this scientific age the narrative in Genesis is a help, not a hindrance to men's souls. Huxley was not far behind, although he seemed to bear a grudge against the "reconcilers," especially the big ones like Gladstone and the English bishops. He urges against their "cruel ingenuities" that "the antique sincerity of the venerable sufferer (Moses) always reasserts itself. Genesis is honest to the core, and professes to be no more than it is, a repository of venerable traditions of unknown origin, claiming no scientific authority, and possessing none." If we add what is now proven by the Babylonian records, that its author was discriminating in excising what was objectionable from the old traditions, and that he succeeded in placing them in fair religious light, we have in Huxley's words a sound though only partial theory of its origin and scope. Just because it does not pose as science, it is of inestimable value to science as a truthful, unvarnished narrative of facts. The traditions have now been dug out of their hiding-places, and we see how carefully they were used, how their numerous and gross errors have been eliminated, and how important truths have been added, not so as to spoil the narrative by prolixity, but so as to impart a heavenly setting to the whole. No friend of the Bible shall ever have cause to be ashamed of its opening chapter.

## 2. THE GARDEN OF EDEN.

Science has very fully approved of putting the origin of our race somewhere in the western part of Central Asia, near the traditional site of Paradise. Even Haeckel, who seems never to miss a chance of diverging from the Bible, places Paradise just south of that

locality, in what is now deep ocean, thus hiding all the evidence, except the one big fact that it is hardly possible that in tertiary times there was land where his hypothetical continent of Lemuria ought to have been.

A great many worthy men have felt difficulty in reconciling the second chapter of Genesis with the first, the fundamental error, on the critics' part, seeming to us to rest in their idea that the two chapters ought to be reconciled. The second chapter does not pose as a second edition of the first, and does not claim to be chronologically arranged; but it comes merely by way of supplement and continuation to supply information which was not previously given, and no parallelizing is possible.

The second chapter has no new account of the Creation. It incidentally refers to the account that had been given; and adds the important information that God had breathed into man a living soul, and that as to the physical part man was just like his environment, "dust from the ground." Now that we know there is no fundamental difference between the dust and the fluids and even the gases, it is scarcely necessary to say that the expression was in fact true, though not in scientific garb. A supplementary addition is no argument for errancy; it has no excuse for its presence unless it adds something or explains something that is otherwise unintelligible.

But some writers have argued that it presents us with an account of the creation of woman which is inconsistent with that given before. On this point we can only remark that we find no account in it of the origin of woman. The first chapter teaches us that she was created in the same way as the man, both as to body and as to soul. "Male and female created he them" was part of one transaction. In the second chapter we are informed how the man and the woman were designed for each other by God, and prepared for each other, until finally the nuptials were consummated, and a blessing added. Part of the preparation was the deep-sleep of the man, in which he dreamed that he beheld the woman grow from his side; just as Ezekiel fancied he saw bones becoming covered with flesh and with skin and the spirit breathed into them. Thus the man was taught his lesson that she was one with himself, and that she was appointed of God to be his helpmeet.

We may add that this exegesis is no novelty, but only the resurrection of an old Greek rendering now applied in an age when evolution is in the air. Ainsworth's *Annotations*, written about the time of King James' Translation, says of Gen. ii. 21: "This deep sleep,

the Greek call an exstacy or trance; which the Scriptures show to have fallen also on men, when they did see visions of God. Gen. xv. 12; Acts x. 10."

The narrative of the Fall, while clothed in characteristic drapery, is validated as to its substance by human history. If men were now innocent, or even as harmless in their practical jokes as monkeys, it might be argued that their disposition was inherited from anthropoid progenitors. But if they are now fallen, it stands to reason that they must sometime, suddenly or gradually, have fallen; and it is a matter of intense interest that Moses gives us some light on this dark subject. Still more interesting is the fact that its very darkness is illuminated by the first promise of the Gospel. To the scientific mind the initial stages or startings of great structures or faculties are most important; and here we have presented in a sentence the earliest glimpse of the greatest thing in the world, how the seed of the woman was to be the Son of God, and was to come for our help, by giving Himself for our redemption. The strong element of Scripture is that it is true to fact, showing us to ourselves just as we are, and not as optimistic dreamers would wish to exhibit us; and even better is its system of using the denunciations of coming judgment as a foil on which to throw the bright glory of salvation. Thus at the beginning of our history it was seen that where man's sin abounded divine grace superabounded.

### 3. THE ANTEDILUVIANS.

Our troubles on this section appear to be due mainly to two causes: (1) the scrappiness of the antediluvian narrative, (2) our perverse system of fancying that we must explain every part of the Bible without regard to its special character. The narrative is very brief, and at the same time seems to be entirely trustworthy; but it leaves many points unexplained where our curiosity is excited, and its main object is religious, giving us glimpses of the favored line, of Abel who pleased God, of Enoch who walked with God and was not, for God took him; and of Enosh, who seems to have been concerned in a great revival of religion, for in his days men began to call on the name of the Lord. The other revivalist, Jonathan Edwards, of blessed memory, was in raptures over this narrative, and supposed that Noah must have been among the fruits of this awakening; and so he was, in all probability, at least indirectly.

Our exegesis has been at fault here, in attempting to extract from the fragmentary notes a very short chronology and a very long antediluvian longevity. And some estimable writers have vainly tried

to mend matters by suggesting that the fruit of the tree of life may have conferred a qualified immortality on our first parents and on their posterity for some generations; a view which we must regard as sacramentarianism run mad.

On the chronological question we have only to refer to the arguments of the late Dr. William H. Green, which we regret to say are not as generally known and understood as their value and importance merit. His volume on *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, after stating that links are missing in the antediluvian lists, gives as his verdict that "No one has a right therefore to denominate a primeval chronology so constructed the Biblical chronology, and set it in opposition to the deductions of science, and thence conclude that there is a conflict between the Bible and science." Yet this is just what is being done by some men who are not ashamed to pose as the enemies of the Bible, and by others who boast of being the enemies of science, and recently by not a few who are friends both of the Bible and science, but fancy that they shall help both by proving their disharmony. In Green's longer article on *Primeval Chronology* (in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1890) there is a telling array of proofs as to the style of Scripture in omitting names when there was no possibility of errancy. Moses was not so stupid, we may be sure, as to have been ignorant of the names of his own father and mother, and yet he gives them wrong if we are required to force our rules upon him. Amram and his three brothers are declared to have had 8600 sons already in Moses' time; and Amram's father is said to have been dead 350 years before Moses was born. Besides this, while by the common mode of exposition there were only four generations from Jacob to Moses, yet in two parallel cases the number was greatly larger; in the one there were seven, and in the other there were eleven generations. The comparison of these facts, and of many others of similar drift, compels Dr. Green to decide that Amram cannot have been the very father of Moses.

Carrying this line of argument back to antediluvian times, he finds that in all probability the patriarchs did not follow each other immediately, but there were many intervals between them, which nullify all proposals to found a chronology upon the narrative. Moses never uses the data for chronological purposes, and he does not even question the Egyptian claim to a long antiquity. In Green's opinion the Mosaic records do not fix, and were not intended to fix, the precise date either of the Flood or of the Creation of the world. To this it may be added that the remoteness of antediluvian times from Moses rendered it impossible for him to enumerate all

the genealogical lines; all he could do was to indicate in a general way the chief stages. If he was so economical of space as to leave out the name of his own father, we may easily forecast how he would treat the long ages of antediluvians.

Whilst he confined his discussion to the chronology, Dr. Green lays down principles that apply also to the longevity. He advocates our using data from any source that may help us in finding the meaning of Scripture; and gives as an illustration of his views the comment on Enosh, "When it is said that Enosh lived ninety years and begat Kenan, this is equally true whether Kenan was himself born when Enosh was ninety years old, or one was then born from whom Kenan sprang. The minimum length is thus indicated, but there may be longer duration represented by omitted names."

In Davis' *Bible Dictionary*, under the title "Noah," we have the same principle tentatively applied to explain patriarchal longevity. In one of the ancestral families of Abraham a child was named Noah, because of a prophetical incident at his birth. The tribe became known by this name (which was probably perpetuated in its successive leaders) until the Noah came who was to build the ark.\*

The difficulty here presented for solution is, in our opinion, the last and most serious in the Old Testament. It was a puzzle to the translators of the Septuagint, to the Samaritan versionists, to Josephus; and in late times was solemnly condemned as opposed to science by the greatest of British anatomists, Richard Owen, who denied the possibility of a man ever living for nine centuries, or obtaining, as some had suggested, a third or fourth dentition. Last year one of our most worthy Christian men of science published a book in which he argues that it is as absurd for Moses to ascribe a longevity of nine centuries to anybody as if he had ascribed to him a tallness of fifty feet. On this aspect of the case Kitto's note about Og, the giant king of Bashan, is apposite. Kitto calls attention to the ancient Jewish writers as great at exaggeration, stating that they represented Moses himself as fifty feet high, whilst they assigned one hundred and twenty feet to Og. He then argues that the modest dimension assigned by Moses not to Og, but to his bedstead, proves that he was not a mere Jew, but had a divine mission (*Pictorial Bible*, on Deut., iii. 11). Whatever then may be the explanation of the patriarchal longevity, we are quite confident that it is not a case of Mosaistic exaggeration.

\* I have added the clause within parentheses.—G. M.

Jewish history presents us with some instances which are parallel with the hypothetical presentation by Davis of that of Noah. Israel and Asshur and Amalek appear first as individuals, but are afterward merged into nationalities; from Amalek another name, Agag, started, and after serving its time, seemed to linger as the affix of Haman, who signified his royal lineage by calling himself the Agagite. Very close to Moses was Pharaoh, who had already passed down through many generations, and was destined to run down through a great many more. One or two casual notes in the Bible indicate that there was a chain in the case, with several links; for such notes there was no space in the more remote and condensed antediluvian records. Pharaoh is longest of the longevities; contemporary of Abraham, threatening death to the infant Moses, and his daughter becoming the child's deliverer; after many centuries giving another daughter in marriage to Solomon, yet soon harboring Jeroboam, who was Solomon's enemy; and some centuries later slaying the good young King Josiah. Not even then do we reach his demise, but he passes outside of Bible history. In one verse of Exodus it is plainly said that the king of Egypt died; but that was not a courtier's term; his *demise* was the most that could be said, and the fashion was to think and speak of such as never dying.

This was a survival of the patriarchal system which dominated among the ancients, and the application of which to antediluvian times will meet the case before us. It did not at all continue into the times of Jewish history; but Moses shows that he was accurately acquainted with it in the past. In fact, Maine's *Ancient Law* informs us that the Book of Genesis is our chief source of information about it, and that students have suffered because of their prejudice against the Mosaic writings. According to Maine, the patriarchal system regarded society in an entirely different way as compared with later times. What was counted by the ancients was not individuals, but families and tribes; and we may presume that after a very long time, Moses, in sketching their progress, would be more anxious to sum up the duration of the family than of its individual leaders; also he would articulate the later upon older families that led to the sacred Abrahamic race. As Maine says, "Corporations never die, and accordingly primitive law considers the entities with which it deals, *i.e.*, the patriarchal family groups, as perpetual and inextinguishable." This system, because of its great convenience, is being revived in our large commercial companies, save that here selection rather than descent is foremost. But of old the chief

official succeeded his father, perpetuating the name, as if the same man, be he called Enosh or Noah, had lived for nearly a millennium. Maine says nothing of the permanency of the chief name. But here Hammurabi comes to our aid. His Code appears to represent the patriarchal system only in its decadence, being broken down by the exigencies of a promiscuous business life, in which individuals were counted. But it reveals relics of the older way, as by its special class-laws, some for the gentry, others for the plain people, and a third class for the slaves. One of its regulations has the special aim of encouraging a childless gentleman to adopt a young boy, giving the lad his own name and an education (Code xxxii, 31-35). If the adoptive son received the name as an important part of his inheritance, how much more an own son?\* If this were the structure of the records in Genesis, it is instructive to observe how Moses directs attention to individual cases of special piety, just as an astronomer, massing hosts of stars into monomial constellations, condescends to give distinctive names to individual stars which are any way remarkable. There are artificial features in these pre-Abrahamic genealogies that may have been adopted by Moses from older records; and it is interesting to observe how naturally the longevities fall down in later and nearer times, until they come to Abraham, and even to his father, where we find ourselves at the natural life of individuals.

Such artifices are not, in our judgment, matters affecting the value or truth of the narrative. They were justified by necessity, in order to help people who were compelled to remember a great many facts which we have in our reference books. So far as Moses was concerned, they were only matters of style.

The only other problem requiring consideration is that of the Deluge. It has been so effectively handled by others that we need only refer to Prestwich's *Tradition of the Flood*, and to our own G. Frederick Wright, who traveled through Central Asia, and explored Lake Baikal and other places for illustrations and evidence. We think that harm has sometimes been done by efforts to unduly localize the Flood.† On the main point Moses appears to be, as usual, correct. Something like what he described actually occurred

\* Thus in *Die Gesetze Hammurabis*, by Dav. Heinrich Müller. Stanley A. Cook on *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi* shows that here we are not quite certain as to the translation. But of the inheritance of the patriarchal name there can be little doubt. Within the tribe the father and son must have had distinctive names; but as to exterms and for public purposes the great name persisted.

† See a summary of Prof. Wright's views in *The Homiletic Review*, April, 1904.

involving much of Central and Western Asia and Southern Europe. We know not whether it was a matter of one brief season or spread over a series of years; but at any rate it was attended with extraordinary destruction of man and beast. *Apropos* of this we may give our note from *The Spectator*, December, 1895: "Sir Henry Haworth on *The Mammoth and the Flood* shows how palaeartic man, excelling as an artist, suddenly disappeared, as did beasts that were his companions, the hyæna, lion, rhinoceros, mammoth, from Europe and other lands. One elephant was found rolled up, his tusks between his hind legs. Neolithic man who succeeded practiced agriculture, and seems not to have excelled as an artist."

#### 4. DARWINISM.

Darwin's *Origin of Species* at first appeared to be a declaration against Mosaism, although its author disavowed any antireligious aim. His theory was by no means novel; it was even hinted at a quarter of a century before his publication by Charles Lyell in his *Principles of Geology*. But Lyell was tired of his geological controversy, and did not like to stir up a new storm; and others who had the same idea in mind were usually incapable of elaborating their schemes. Darwin was more courageous, and his charming style of describing his observations secured a hearing. His great weakness was that his ingenuity led him too liberally to depend on doubtful expedients and on imaginary factors that were unverifiable. The British scientific school is largely made up of hero-worshippers, who have sometimes regarded his lucubrations almost as authoritative. As against this reverence, some eminent writers, a few of them in America, invented new speculations, having no experimental basis, and usually raising as many ghosts as they laid. Quite recently the psychologists have been adding to the confusion with new speculations, but not much experimental advance.

Amidst all this the strength of Darwin's case lay in the fact that he had unquestionably got hold of some solid discoveries as to scientific details, as about fertilization of plants and the benefit of crossing, about animal and vegetable affinities and rudiments, and the use of the theory of descent as a guide to classification, and as to distribution. His work imparted a powerful stimulus to the new Biology; and rendered his main theme, of the origin of new species by descent from older species, highly probable, if not scientifically proven. Of late the situation has changed; and the sky is clearing. First of all, we have such a thorough investigation of the merits and demerits of Darwinism as is presented by Thomas

H. Morgan's *Evolution and Adaptation*; perhaps sometimes too rigorously conducted, but in general fair and wholesome. Thus Morgan shows that the method of the English Darwinian school has been to imagine that some organ in a plant or animal is useful, and then to account for the origin of that organ by its supposed utility. The inheritance of characters that had been accidentally acquired was a necessary assumption of Darwinism, yet the weight of evidence has been found to go against such assumption. It is now becoming established, however, that Darwin was right on the main topic, of the origin of new species by being derived from the older species. The frequent challenge to show us an evolutionized species has now been met. Lyell has shown long ago that if new species were to arise in our time, the event should occur so rarely that the fact of their being innovations should never be known. When brought to notice they should be regarded as newly discovered, not as newly produced. Yet this rare observation has actually come into prominence. One plant, the Evening Primrose, of a species which is reputed to have been transferred from Virginia to the Old World, and is now cultivated in Europe, has been startling people by its trick of generating new species. The old challenge that the Darwinians should give even one instance of a newly produced species is now taken up by Dr. DeVries, of Amsterdam, who has experimentally done what Mr. Darwin gave the Creator the credit of doing, originated new species by the help of second causes. Such experiments are best made with plants, as they need no cages to prevent their running away, and are harmless, uncomplaining things, never squealing, nor provoking vigilant societies for the prevention of cruelty to plants to torment us unfortunate experimenters. It is believed that with proper limitations the results are applicable also to animals.

As DeVries' new species appeared only from a particular mother-species, it is supposed that, at least temporarily in some groups, and perhaps also in other groups, there may be a procreative stage, which by producing inheritable mutations may give rise to new species. This recalls and illustrates many old observations about sports which reinforce the inference. If it were established as a general law, it would reinforce the teleological argument that evolution is a divinely organized method of maintaining the balance of nature by originating new species to replace older forms that have become extinct.

Whilst DeVries is a first-class observer, no scientific theories can be derived from the testimony and arguments of an individual.

And accordingly our friends of the New York Botanical Garden have taken in hand the review and verification of his work. Miss Vail, a very competent botanist, was sent over to Europe, where she explored the gardens and the libraries and museums so as to find all about this Evening Primrose and its variations; and she also obtained seeds of the mother-species and its mutations from Prof. DeVries. On her return, Dr. MacDougall, of the New York Garden, planted some of the seeds and carefully studied their behavior and the result. His work entirely confirmed DeVries. Thus is proved for the first time the main thesis of Darwinism; but not in the way which Darwin supposed. It is not by the Darwinian hypothesis of accumulating infinitesimal variations, but by the more definite route of considerable mutations; not by slow development, but apparently by a more or less marked *per-saltum* mutation that they come.

We expect for the future that the scientists and the clergy shall unite in celebrating this remarkable synthesis of Mosaism and Darwinism, as combining to explain the divine method of creating the new and of ordering the old. But we neither expect nor desire ever to see evolution elevated to be an article of our Christian faith; such is not its function, and we do not wish to see any scientific theory so stereotyped as to prohibit resubmission to tests.

Just on the heels of DeVries' discovery comes the news that forty years ago an humble Austrian monk, Mendel, had investigated and discovered in an experimental way the laws of inheritance which prevailed among the old species, and doubtless also in the production of new species. The world was then so much occupied with Darwinian Natural Selection, that it had no ear for an experimental achievement which did not exactly harmonize with its pet idea. Mendel, like DeVries, worked on plants, and he showed that when the parents differ in a marked way, the offspring do not all become intermediate, but some follow the fashion of the father and others of the mother-plant; yet each contains in a latent condition the opposite characters, which shall reappear in their offspring of a new generation. It seems probable that this rule holds equally with plants and animals, the grandfather's marks reappearing in the grandson. Just when DeVries had proved that definite mutations, and not at all the promiscuous variations which Darwin exploited, afford the materials on which heredity can act, the Mendelian laws came to lay down the mathematical lines of activity; both of them together supplementing Darwin's scheme in a fashion that should

probably astonish both Darwin and Moses, if they were here to see how things are moving.

This necessary reconstruction of views is a frequent but by no means unpleasant exercise for the men who are most concerned. It means progress, which is the law of health both in science and in divinity, the "treasures new as well as old" of which our Saviour spake. Every well-ordered step is only a starting-point for another step, and for further progress; and every change is helpful and exhilarating if it signifies an advance; and as we have recently broken new ground both in orientalism and in evolution-lore, further advances are ahead. Nor will these changes detract from the honor due to the men who toiled under greater difficulties, for we are only reaping where they sowed. I think, however, that it teaches us that Christian leaders ought to be both friendly toward new investigations and yet conservative, so as not to render faith in any way contingent upon theories which are not proven. Nobody at this date, for example, knows how the case as to the evolution of man will turn out; many workers are industriously elaborating that most interesting problem, but we are still in the dark. We need not, however, be surprised if, ere long, all these problems shall be cleared up, so far as scientific discovery can clear problems. There will still remain the questions from the divine side, on which Moses and his inspired successors are our guides, and there is small hope of human research ever dispelling the mystery of our inner life.

*Princeton University.*

G. MACLOSKIE.

## IV.

### VORAGINE AS A PREACHER.

JACOBUS de Varagine, or Voragine,\* is rather well known in these days as the author of the Golden Legend, but the many other achievements of this accomplished and versatile man seem forgotten. This is especially true of his contributions to the art and practice of preaching. The historians of preaching know little of him; Neale does not even mention him among the twenty mediæval preachers whom he quotes. And yet the blessed Giacomo was not only one of the most popular preachers of his time, both to the common people in the vernacular and to the Religious in the Latin, but he wrote a treatise on the art of preaching, a volume of sermon aids, and published sermons which continued among the most popular for more than two hundred years. He is possibly the most popular sermon writer of the late Middle Ages, and there are probably more manuscripts of his sermons extant than of fifteen out of Neale's twenty mediæval preachers put together. His sermons, like the Legend, became known as "Golden" by reason of their popularity. He has, moreover, some claim to be called the father of modern preaching.†

Even to have been great among preachers of his own day would have been no small thing. It was the age of the revival of preaching. The two great orders of preaching friars, the minorities of St. Francis and the "preachers" of St. Dominic (Voragine's own order) had been founded only a few years before his birth in order to fight heresy by preaching. While he was a child, John of Vicenza was preaching to audiences of a hundred thousand the doctrine of that peace and reconciliation which it was to be Voragine's own peculiar

\* The spelling of the name is retained with much reluctance, since by him and in his day it was never spelled otherwise than Varagine, Voragine being a punning form given in later days and adopted in the early printed editions. Jacobus de Voragine, of the Order of Preachers, was born about 1228, at Varazze; wrote the *Golden Legend* before 1258; was Provincial of Lombardy 1267-76, 1281-86; became Archbishop of Genoa 1292, and died there 1298.

† Razzi, *Istoria degli huomini ill. . . . del ord. degli Predicatori*. 1596: "and he was the first to discover that style of preaching exhibited by him in his sermons."

mission also to proclaim, and with which his name was to be forever associated in the Church. Anthony of Padua was still living, and St. Francis and St. Dominic themselves were not long dead. Living and preaching at the same time with Voragine were Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and, even greater as a preacher, the seraphic doctor St. Bonaventura. Before his death Master Eckhart, of his own order, soon to be Master of Tauler and Suso, was already becoming famous.

Somewhere between the popular preachers John of Vicenza and Anthony of Padua, on the one hand, and the scholastic Albertus and Aquinas, on the other, stands the versatile Voragine, acceptable both to clergy and laity, both in Latin and in the vernacular. More or less scholastic in method, reflecting in some degree the style common to many of the great preachers of his order, he had also a certain sense of the popular which gives even to his Latin sermons a quality not to be found in such degree among any of his scholastic contemporaries.

It is not strange that the author of the *Golden Legend* should have been popular as a preacher among the common people, or that the first translator of the Bible into Italian (if, in fact, this was Voragine) should have had special skill in speaking to the people in the common language. Such was indeed the fact. In those earliest days of the Italian language he spoke it, so it is said, with remarkable elegance, and whether Italian or Latin, it is certain that he spoke with force and pungency, and was acceptable to the common people. On the other hand, as Provincial of his order for Lombardy, which embraced at that time almost all of Italy north of Rome, and many convents, he must have been continually visiting the monasteries and preaching to the clergy, who in his time, the time of the founding of the universities, were obliged by their rules to maintain something of a university in every convent. Bologna was in his district, and it was under his provincialate that St. Thomas Aquinas was called there to teach under the direction thus of Voragine, since St. Thomas was a Dominican. He was therefore constantly preaching to the most educated and most cultivated men of his time, as well as to the lowliest, and he seems to have been equally acceptable to the Court, to the Religious and to the common people. So acceptable was the preaching that he was soon in demand, not only in his own neighborhood, but throughout all Italy, and preached as an evangelist in almost all the chief cities of the land. Moreover, his preaching was effective to distinct results, for it is said in the Dominican breviary, that he "wrought a mighty

reformation of morals among the people and influenced to love of virtue many who had been given over to love of pleasure." We know also that by his exhortation, in pulpit and out, he succeeded in making and keeping more or less peace between the before ever-warring factions of Guelfs and Ghibellines in Genoa.

Voragine's published sermons are all in Latin. Those in Italian have perished or been lost, if any were ever written down, which may be doubted. One may perhaps get an idea of what his Italian style was from two little treatises and especially one "On the virtues and vices," but of sermons proper there are no identified Italian ones extant. There is little reason to doubt that, after the manner of the time, he wrote all his sermons, or sermon outlines, in Latin, and preached in the Italian from these notes. It may be that these very Latin sermons that we now have were preached to the people in their language, probably in free paraphrase, with much elaboration and adaptation to audience. Failing a devoted hearer to take down and preserve, as was done for Tauler, the vernacular sermons may never have gotten into writing at all. However that may be, the extant sermons are all Latin, but there is no lack of these—a thousand, say, of which more than seven hundred are in print. These extant sermons include at least five long series, of which four have been printed. The printed ones correspond with the list which Voragine himself gives us in his chronicle, and are as follows: "Sermons on all the saints," "Sermons on the Gospels for Sundays and festivals," "Sermons on the Gospels in Lent" and the "Mariale." Besides these there are series of "Visitation sermons" and perhaps "Doctrinal sermons," besides a number of occasional sermons.

The sermons on all the saints follow the Dominican Church calendar for the year and, like the Golden Legend, cover not only the saints, but the festivals, Advent, etc. The sermons, in fact, parallel the Golden Legend. The "Legends" are named, it will be remembered, not from being tales, but from the fact that they are "Readings" on the saints for each of the calendar days. They form, in short, a lectionary exactly similar to the Gospel lectionary (evangelistary) which forms the basis of his Sunday and Lenten sermons, and were evidently intended to be read during service. One may find in the Dominican breviary to-day a similar reading on Voragine himself.

The number of sermons on each saint or festival varies from two to nine. The total number is 307.

These sermons are given first in the list by Voragine and may

perhaps have been the first published of his sermons, although there is some doubt as to this. In any event they might naturally have followed the Legend, which was probably written before 1258, as the completion of a plan.

It is to be noted, in the first place, that these sermons are by no means biographies of the saints; they are "Improvements" or "Lessons" drawn from the lives and miracles, not a rehearsal of the facts. They rather seem to take for granted that the corresponding passage of the Legend has been read earlier in the same service, in the same way that other sermons take for granted that the appropriate Gospel has been read. Such biographical facts as there are, are therefore allusions for hearers who have the details of the life so freshly in mind that these did not need to be repeated.

It would be equally a mistake for one to suppose that the treatment, because founded on the Golden Legend in some sort, was unscriptural. On the contrary, each sermon has its Scriptural text, and the usual proportion of references to Scripture, sometimes twenty or thirty in a sermon. The lessons drawn from the lives of the saints do not differ essentially from those which a modern preacher would draw from, say, the lives of Andrew and Peter, or, for that matter, of Livingston and Hannington. Some matter-of-course acceptance of apocryphal events and ecclesiastical miracles, as well as the actual worship of the saints, must certainly be discounted by Protestants; but, apart from this, Voragine's treatment of the saints in his sermons does not differ at bottom very much from that, say, of sermons which were preached, even from Protestant pulpits, on the death of Leo XIII or on recent anniversaries of Wesley and Edwards. The modern biographical sermons, of which much is being made just now, are often less Scriptural and less pointed in their spiritual and practical application than these mediæval ones; and when one considers how much is made in modern biographical sermons of the evidences to spiritual character in the matter of direct answer to prayer, one wonders, in fact, where to draw the line even on ecclesiastical miracles. The difference seems to lie, in fact, almost wholly in the circumstances of the time and the state of critical scholarship at the time. The sermons are, in themselves, sane, intelligent, ingenious and practical applications of the biographical facts rehearsed in the Legenda, for spiritual edification, on the ground of the text, the lesson being drawn from the text itself, and illustrated from the life of the saint. Although the exegesis is at times somewhat free and allegorical, it compares not unfavorably

with some modern popular pulpit exegesis, and for the time must be counted remarkably good.

Take, for example, the fifth sermon on Saint Dominic, the founder of Voragine's own order. The text is "2d Timothy 4":\* "Do the work of an evangelist, fulfill thy ministry, be sober." "These words," he says, "show that St. Dominic was praiseworthy as regards his neighbor, as regards God, as regards himself; toward his neighbor, in that he did the 'work of an evangelist'; toward God, in that he 'fulfilled his ministry' and as to himself, in that he was 'sober.'"

That Voragine's attitude toward the miraculous is by no means one foolishly credulous, but on the contrary has something of the modern critical spirit even, is shown by one of his sermons on the stigmata of St. Francis. The text is, of course, "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." There were, he says, five reasons in St. Francis' heart which were the causes of the stigmata upon his body. The first of these was a vivid imagination. He gives then two examples of childbirth showing that a vivid impression on the mother's mind affects the child's body, and says this is true also of animals. In the same way, he says, the wounds of the Passion were impressed on the flesh of St. Francis through his vivid imagination. The second reason was ardent love, which also has the power of imprinting the image of the loved upon the lover. The third reason is intense (earnest) contemplation. The fourth is profound meditation. The fifth is strong sympathy. All of these are, he says, capable of imprinting a mental image on the flesh.

His method of biographical allusion, when he uses direct allusion at all in these sermons, which is somewhat rarely, is sufficiently indicated by a short quotation from the same fifth sermon on St. Dominic mentioned above. Elaborating the second section, on St. Dominic's ministry of God's service, he speaks of his ministry of love, of faith, and of works, and adds: "In the fourth place, he gave himself wholly unto God. For since he had received from God body and soul and estate, he in turn gave to his neighbor his body to be sold, as appeared in the Legenda, his soul to suffer with him, whence it is said of him that the Lord gave to him special

\* Some attempt was made to reconcile the Scripture quotations and references quoted from Voragine in this paper with the English versions, but between the differences of the Vulgate and Voragine's own transpositions and paraphrases it seemed best to quote the reference given in the form given, and make such translation of Scripture passages as seemed best suited to express the meaning that Voragine took from them.

grace to weep for miserable and afflicted sinners, and his estate to aid, for he gave all his goods to the poor." Each of these allusions corresponds to an incident given in the Legend.

The sixth and seventh sermons of the series on the Assumption of the Virgin are examples of the somewhat rare and interesting dialogue sermon. Both these sermons are on Eccles. 24, "I am like a cedar of Lebanon," etc. The six trees here mentioned—cedar, cypress, palm, rose, olive and plane—represent, he says, the six orders of the saints in Heaven, that is to say, virgins, confessors, martyrs, apostles, prophets and patriarchs. The sermon is supposed to represent a conversation with each of these orders in turn, when the Virgin Mother visited them on her Assumption. The second sermon on the same passage is on the nine aromas which represent, he says, the nine orders of angels with whom the Virgin converses in the same way. The conversation with each of the orders in both sermons is much the same and consists of prayer to the Virgin that she will stay, and her answer that she will not leave them but will abide as a "palm" or as "balsain," etc. The holy martyrs, for example: "You ought to be with us, Lady, thou who wert martyr and more than martyr, whom the lance of such great pain pierced, such constancy armed and so great love inflamed." "She responds, I will not leave you, children, but as a palm in Cades I will abide with you." The preacher then goes on to explain that by palm is meant victory, by Cades the martyrs. This is, in fact, about all the "dialogue" there is under any head, the bulk of the sermon being taken up with elucidations. The idea seems clearly borrowed from those dialogue elements of the Church liturgy which were the historical beginning of our modern drama.

Rothe\* says that all the sermons of the Lenten series are conversations between the Christian and his good and evil angels. What he means by this it is impossible to say. It does not appear to be the fact, but it would be venturesome to say that the above are the only conversational sermons of Voragine, and there may be one or more overlooked among the Lenten sermons.

This series of sermons is, as a whole, perhaps, the least valuable of the three main series. But however Protestant a man may be, he would be very unresponsive not to profit, more or less, spiritually from the lessons of the strictly biographical sermons among them, sermons which bring out so practically, so soundly and often so charmingly the lessons of humility, self-sacrifice, love and devotion from the lives of good men and women.

\* Rothe, *R. Gesch. d. Predigt.*, Bremen, 1881, p. 244.

With the sermons on the saints may, perhaps, be classed the *Mariale*. Formally speaking, the Sunday and Lenten sermons are nearer to those on the saints and with them make up a group, possibly a consistent series, all alike following the order of the church year. On the other hand, the *Mariale* is like the sermons on the saints, in its biographical motive and method. It finds personal qualities in the subject for the hearers to approve and imitate, and develops the topics in a way similar to those of the sermons on the saints.

This series comes last in Voragine's list, and may, therefore, have been composed last, but except for the position one would be tempted to assign it to that much earlier period of his life when the remarkable wave of Virgin worship was at its height, in the middle of the century. The work consists of 159 sermons on the various virtues or titles of the Virgin arranged alphabetically, "Abstinence, Advocate, Aider," etc. She is an almond tree, a balsam, a cedar, a cinnamon, a cypress, an olive, a palm; she is the lily, rose and vine; she is moon and star, star of the morning and star of the sea; cloud and heaven itself; she is dove and lamb, myrrh and spikenard and galbanum, queen and empress, ivory and the pearl of God—and so on to the number of 144 in all, reminding one of the Litany of Loreto as now used in the Roman Catholic Church.

Although by the nature of things these sermons are more or less mystical, yet the treatment is less rhapsodical than that of many preachers on this theme. On the contrary, they are sometimes marked by the same excellencies of sanity, Scriptural treatment, and, to a degree of relative practicality, characteristic of Voragine's style in general. They often do not differ greatly from the sermons which might be written on any Scripture character and are sometimes spiritually most suggestive. Take, for example, the twelfth sermon under V on the *Unity* between Christ and the Blessed Virgin His mother. He says that there are four kinds of unity: first, that of man and wife; second, that of parent and child; third, the social unity between friend and friend; fourth, spiritual unity between the human spirit and God. This last was Mary's love for her son, to whom she was united by love, because she was wholly turned into love, as iron placed in the fire becomes itself wholly fire—only that her love was greater than this, because it could not be extinguished by the water of tribulation.

In the fifth sermon under the same letter, the *Words (verba)* of the Blessed Mary have, he says, five praiseworthy aspects: first,

they were not prolix but very few and brief; second, they were not lightly uttered but carefully premeditated; third, they were not forward but timid and modest; fourth, they were not careless but very discreet, "for he who speaks must see to it what, when, to whom, where, and how he speaks." He goes on to develop each topic as a subhead. The obvious practical thrusts of this sermon against garrulosity gain perhaps in piquancy what they lose in justice by being addressed especially to women. He says, for example, "that, considering to whom she should speak, she did not talk to any man, but to the angel of God, through which we are instructed that women should avoid talking to men. She considered *where* she should speak and did not talk in the market-place, but in the house, by which women are taught that they should not talk in public but should be taught by their husbands at home."

The sixth sermon under S is a typical example of the more metaphorical sort. The Virgin Mary is called a mirror (*speculum*) for four reasons: first, on account of the composition of the mirror which is of glass and lead, glass for her virginity, lead for its ductility and ashen color, which signify humility. . . . In the third place, she is called a mirror because of her representation of things, "for as all things are reflected from a mirror, so in the Blessed Virgin, as in the mirror of God, ought all to see their impurities and spots, and purify and correct them, for the proud, beholding her humility see their blemishes, the avaricious see theirs in her poverty, the lovers of pleasure theirs in her virginity."

In these sermons the place of the usual text is taken by some title or virtue of the Virgin Mary. They are thus in some sort topical, but although the text is absent from the beginning it is, after all, not far away, since each of the qualities treated is brought into relation with a text or texts somewhere on the divisions being drawn exegetically from the text.

The three sermons mentioned above all have their texts, so to speak, *passim*, each subheading having its text, as is in fact true of those which have a general text as well, but many of the sermons have also a general text. Thus the ninth under P, the BEAUTY of the Virgin Mary (*pulchritudo*) has the general text from first Canticles, "I am black but comely." Beauty he says is white for purity, black for humility, and red for love. Again, the first sermon under R, QUEEN of HEAVEN (*regina*) has the text from Psalm 44: "The queen stands at thy right hand"; and the fourth sermon on the Virgin Mary as a ROSE has text from Ecclesiastic. 24, "As a garden of roses in Jericho."

The Sunday and the Lenten sermons which follow the sermons on the saints, and precede the *Mariale*, fall into a group together. They are both series of "gospel sermons" following the order of the Gospels for the Church year, and are alike in ranging over the whole field of general evangelical preaching. They are "general" sermons, as distinguished from those on the saints, on the doctrines, on the Virgin, or for visitations. As such they are the most interesting of all the sermons of this author, the most varied in character, and on the whole highest in quality. Of the two, the Lenten sermons are perhaps the more mature and may be regarded as the high-water mark of Voragine's work, or at least the most typical representative of the whole range of his work, of any single series. One may open almost at haphazard in these and find within a few dozen pages examples of all the most characteristic styles. Open, for example, at the first sermon in the fourth day of the third week in Lent. This is a good example of the illustrative sermon; the following is rather allegorical; the next is noteworthy for its minute scholastic subdivision, and, skipping one, there is an admirable example of simple Scriptural exposition in the story of the Woman of Samaria.

These Lenten sermons consist of two sermons on the Gospel for the day, for each day from Ash-Wednesday until Tuesday after Easter—100 in all. From their position in the list of Voragine, as well as from a certain superiority to the others in maturity of style, it is fair to suppose that this volume was the last published of the great series of sermons.

The Sunday sermons come second in the list of Voragine, but in his Preface he shows a certain diffidence about publishing which seems more appropriate to one putting forth a maiden effort than to one who had already published a considerable series. He is led to their publication, he says, "not by any excess of rash daring, but by urgent importunity of the brethren," and he goes on to say "that he hopes that in spite of his slight knowledge and inadequate ability, divine goodness will supplement, brotherly love aid, and the sincere intention that I have excuse my imperfections."

This series consists of three sermons on each Sunday Gospel, as the Preface says, "in honor of the three persons of the Trinity, of the glorious Mother of God, and of the blessed Saint Dominic our father." In the chronicle Voragine, speaking of this series, makes no mention of the Virgin or St. Dominic, but seems to imply that the three sermons are in honor of the three persons of the Trinity. There are in all 158 of these Sunday sermons.

Almost every variety of general style may be found in these two series. There are sermons from a single text, sermons from a whole passage, and all sorts of thematic sermons. Some sermons are simple, direct, bare of all illustration save Scripture quotation; others are in the highly allegorical method so popular in the Middle Ages, where, instead of the plain and direct interpretations, the most fanciful meanings are placed upon the words of the text, and these figures placed again upon all fours and carried to the extreme; and still others here and there are of scholastic elaborateness. Again, the sermons will be a shrewd mingling of all styles of good exposition, apt illustration, reasonable subdivision and sufficiently chastened metaphor.

An example of the common single verse sermon is on Wednesday of the fourth week, the second sermon: "He went, therefore, and washed and came seeing." When a man is spiritually illumined there are three signs: he enters the right way, washes away his spots, even the least of them, and thereupon he sees clearly.

Of many examples of the sermon founded on the whole Gospel for the day, the first sermon on Saturday of the second week in Lent will do as well as another. "In this Gospel," he says, "three things are to be noted: first, the going away of the sinner, when it is said 'he went away into a far country'; second, the conversion of the sinner, when it is said 'he returned to himself'; third, the gracious reception by God, when it is said 'his father saw him and was moved with compassion.'"

An example of the thematic is the second sermon of Monday of the sixth week: "'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things unto myself.' Christ by His passion draws all things to Himself, that is, things terrestrial, things celestial, and things infernal—celestial by reconciling the Father, terrestrial by converting the Gentiles, infernal by freeing the holy Fathers who were in Limbo."

A good example of what may be called the simple expository style is the first sermon of the Friday of the third week in Lent on the fourth chapter of St. John. More than half this sermon is taken up with the straightforward story of the "Samaritan Woman," so simply told as to be almost a paraphrase. Beside this, there is in the whole sermon by way of illustration only half a dozen quotations from Scripture, one anecdote, and one quotation from Augustine.

The use of Scripture quotation and quotation from the Fathers is common to all the sermons of all series, but sometimes quotations

from the Scripture, which often number as many as thirty in a single short sermon, so predominate over other quotations for illustration as to produce what may be counted a special style of Scriptural or Scripture-quotation sermon, as the predominance of anecdote over the others produces what may be called the anecdotal sermon. There are a number of sermons which have no illustrations save Scripture quotations, but these do not necessarily produce the Scripture-quotation style, although when the number rises above thirty something like it is necessarily produced. An example of this Scripture style is found in the Lenten series in the first sermon on the day of the Lord's Supper, on the text "Let each prove himself, so shall he eat of the bread and drink of the cup." His final point is on the usefulness of the sacrament at time of death. It contains but 144 words, and these include twelve quotations; "for the way," he says, "which the soul departing from the body must take is a darksome way. 'In my path he put darkness' (Job 19); it is a dangerous way, wherefore 'In the way in which I walked they laid a snare for me' (Ps. 141); it is a long way, 'A great way remains to you' (3 Kings 19); it is an unknown way, 'The way of the city of thy habitation they did not find' (Ps.). When, therefore, the body of Christ is given to souls about to die, they carry with them light for the illumination of the dark way: 'I am the light of the world' (John 12); likewise, 'Walk while ye have the light, lest the darkness overtake you' (John 8). They have with them a pugilist for defense against enemies: 'Put me beside thee, and who shall fight against me' (John 11 or Job 17); 'Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me' (Ps. 22, Vulg.). They have with them food for comforting them: 'Bread strengthening the heart of man' (Ps. 103); 'He walked in the strength of that food unto Horeb, the mountain of God' (3 Kings 19). They have with them a leader to guide their way: 'The way mounted up, stretching out before them' (Mich. 2); 'He bringeth them unto their desired haven' (Ps. 106)."

An idea of Voragine's allegorical sermons may be had from the Sunday series for the third Sunday after the octave of Epiphany. All three are from the text (Matt. 8): "And when he was entered into the boat his disciples followed him." In the first of the three sermons the boat is of "penitence," since by it man is brought into the harbor of salvation; in the second, it is the "holy Church" which (following Chrysostom) (1) Sails the sea of this present life, (2) Has God for helmsman, (3) Angels for rowers, (4) All the saints for cargo, (5) Christ for mast, (6) Evangelical doc-

trine for sail, (7) The Holy Spirit for motive power, (8) Transports to the haven of Paradise. In the third sermon Jesus is entering (*ascendente*) or going up into the boat "that is his cross by which he passed over the sea of this present age." Concerning this boat of the cross he says five things are to be observed: (1) Its cause, (2) Its mast, (3) Its sail, (4) Its supercargo or merchant, (5) Its cargo or merchandise. Its cause is fourfold—efficient, material, formal and final. The efficient cause is the Holy Trinity, the material cause the four kinds of wood in the cross which signify the fourfold efficiency of the cross—cedar which drives away ill thoughts as its odor drives off snakes, cypress for constancy in trial and tribulation, the palm for victory and the olive to mitigate the bitterness of penitence, as its oil soothes wounds. In these four circumstances, he says, we are accustomed to use the sign of the cross—when assailed by evil thoughts, in sudden peril, in pain or terror. The formal cause is that the ship is narrow in the bow, broad in the middle and narrow again at the stern. So of the cross. The final cause was in order that man might safely pass the sea of life, "For this world is a sea, a valley and a stream; therefore he prepared for us a cross as a boat, a ladder and a bridge." The cross is a boat to pass over the sea, a ladder with which to mount from the valley, a bridge across the stream. In the second place, the mast was Christ, who like the fruit of the cedar, is of triple substance—His most sweet divinity, His flesh full of bitterness, His soul full of suffering as regards His flesh, and of sweetness as regards His divinity. And, third, He was the sail wrought of white, of red, of gold—white for His earthly flesh, red His soul most fervent in love, gold for His most precious divinity; white for the purity of His flesh, red for the love of His soul, gold for His divine majesty. And, fourth, the supercargo, which is Christ, carries on the ship His bread, that is Himself; and, fifth, the cargo. The merchandise of this world is birth, labor and death. Christ gives and takes in this barter; takes from us what here abounds, birth, labor and death, gives in return regeneration, resurrection and eternal life.

A fair example of Voragine's anecdotal sermons is the first sermon of Wednesday in the third week of Lent. The last one-third of this sermon contains two points, expressed in less than two pages and illustrated by six illustrations. The point that we are led by natural instinct to honor our parents is shown by the example of the daughter who kept her mother alive in prison, by the example of the swans which care for their parents while "vultures alone allow their parents to die of hunger," and the example of the

Scythians who did not resent the destruction of their property, but declared that they would resist the desecration of their parents' tombs with all their power. Again, illustrating the saying that "It is that which proceeds from a man's mouth which defiles him," he gives illustrations from three ancient philosophers. When Socrates was asked why, among many talkers, he kept silent, he replied, "Because I have often repented my words, never having kept silent." Solon, also, when asked why he kept silence, whether because he did not know how to speak or because he was a fool, replied, "No fool can keep silence." Zenocrates also, when asked the same question, replied, "Because we have received from nature one mouth, but two ears." He quotes also the philosopher who said to a talkative person, "If you should hear yourself with our ears you would keep silent." After this illustration Voragine tersely closes his sermon: "Therefore it is said, 'The silent man is counted wise, hateful the garrulous.'"

Perhaps a better example of the anecdotal sermon is the third sermon on the first Sunday after the octave of Epiphany, from the text "There was a marriage in Cana of Galilee." The subdivisions are: (1) What sort of a wife one should marry, (2) how a good wife is to be recognized, (3) how she is to be loved, (4) how she is to be guarded, (5) how she is to be punished, and (6) how she shall live after her husband's death. There are a round dozen of anecdotes. (1) "Areolous" (Theophrastus) is asked whether a wise man should marry, the upshot of his answer being that he should marry a good wife or none at all; (2) The same philosopher is again asked whether it is better to marry a beautiful or an ugly wife; (3) Esther the queen displeased Ahasuerus when she was painted, but when she came to him pale and tremulous she pleased him; (4) Themistius is asked whether he prefers a poor and learned son-in-law or one rich and ignorant; (5) Theophrastus is asked which is better, the poor and gentle wife or the rich and contentious one; (6) Theophrastus is asked whether a wife is to be guarded; (7) The stock illustration of Duellius and his bad breath; (8) Suicide of a Theban virgin; (9) Suicide of Lucretia; (10) Example of Marcia, daughter of Cato; (11) Example of Valeria; (12) The example of the widow Amica who did not wish another husband, because if good she would always be in fear of losing him, and if bad she would always be in misery on account of the contrast with his good predecessor. Beside these twelve anecdotes, the sermon is illustrated by quotations from Seneca, Sixtus, seven quotations from the Fathers, and as many from the Scripture.

It is only fair to Voragine, in this connection, where the theme necessarily puts him in a somewhat critical attitude toward marriage, to say that he repeatedly bears tribute in his sermons to human love, and encourages the mutual love of husband and wife: "That a man should love his wife from the heart is shown by the fact that woman was created from the part of his body nearest the heart, and that a wife should love her husband from the heart is shown by the fact that the Church requires the ring upon the fourth finger of the bride—to which fourth finger the naturalists say a special vein proceeds directly from the heart."

Rothe speaks of the sermons of Voragine as all given over to endless subdivisions and strongly scholastic in style. There are, in fact, examples of the extreme subdivision characteristic of the scholastic style; but among the printed sermons, at least, any great intricacy is rather rare. Although the majority of the sermons are laid off in one, two, three order, the skeleton is generally very clear and not so very complex. It may be the prejudice of a special student, but to characterize or classify the sermons of Voragine as scholastic seems distinctly misleading. The orderly method of the scholastic is there, but seldom the dryness of the true scholastic sermon.

Following is one of the most intricate of what may be called his scholastic sermons. It is the first sermon on Thursday of the third week in Lent. The text is the whole Gospel for the day, from Luke 4, the healing of Simon's wife's mother. "In this Gospel," he says, "it is shown how Christ did three mighty deeds—one of power, one of pity, and one of wisdom." The work of power was the healing. Under this heading three things are to be noted—the nature of the infirmity, the manner of curing, and the effects of the cure. Concerning the nature of the disease, which was a fever, it is to be observed that one characteristic of the fever-stricken is that sweet things seem bitter to their taste or tasteless, and contrarywise. So it is with the spiritual palate of the sinner—spiritual things are bitter or tasteless. Christ shows this of three classes: 1. The luxurious: As the appetite of the lion is not roused by the sight of a green meadow because he eats flesh, not grass, so the luxurious do not long for spiritual things. 2. The proud: As rain falling upon a stone wets it outside but leaves it dry within, so the proud with their stony hearts are unmooistened by the rain of divine grace. 3. The avaricious: As a drop of honey falling into a jar full of vinegar loses its sweetness without making sweet the vinegar, so the avaricious who have hearts of vinegar are not sweetened by the

divine word. The word is lost and their heart is not changed. In the second place is to be noted the manner of curing, that is by prayer. The sinner is (1) defiled; (2) hostile to God; and (3) lame. In the third place there is the effect of the cure: "Rising up she ministered unto them." The sinner ought not to remain in sin but to arise, otherwise he falls from sin to sin, and for three reasons: one, the heaviness of sin; two, the blindness of the sinner; three, a certain relation of cause and effect, through which avarice leads to robbery, gluttony to drunkenness, pride to violence, etc. The second mighty work, the work of pity, was the driving out of demons. The third mighty work, the work of wisdom, was the preaching of Christ. The outline may be represented graphically as follows: I. The work of power, (1) The nature of the infirmity, (a) the luxurious, (b) the proud, (c) the avaricious, (2) The manner of curing, (a) defilement, (b) hostility to God, (c) lameness, (3) The effect of the cure, (a) the heaviness of sin, (b) blindness of the sinner, (c) a certain relation of cause and effect; II. The second mighty work, the work of pity; III. The third mighty work, the work of wisdom.

The Visitation sermons and Doctrinal sermons are mentioned in all the articles on Voragine, but none of his three biographers seem to have seen either series. The former, at least, are in fact extant in a manuscript at Florence which contains several works certainly by Voragine, and others possibly or probably by him.\* This is number two of the manuscript. Number three, following these sermons on occasion of visitations to the Religious, is a treatise "On the education of the religious," and this is extant also in another manuscript. The Visitation sermons include fifty-three discourses more or less, the first being appropriately from the text (John 14), "I have chosen you out of the world." Number six of this work is rather brief for the Doctrinal sermons, but may perhaps be this series, since the final page contains a sort of *Index expurgatorius* of "Opinions in the work not commonly held by moderns." One would like to see what this man, who was *par excellence* "The Theologian" of his region in his time, had to say on doctrine, for there is surprisingly little of it except by inference in his printed works. What there is is often expressed more poetically than dogmatically, e.g., a notion of the Person of Christ: "For musical sound comes by the action of wind in a musical instrument. The wind is divinity,

\* The rather cursory examination made of this manuscript would have been made much more thorough if it had been realized at the time that it contained such important material and that no other manuscript of several of the treatises would turn up.

the musical instrument the body of our Lord, and from this double nature, divine and human, arises that musical sound—the name of Jesus" (Epiph. 5).

Besides the long series of sermons there are several occasional ones extant, of which two are accessible in the printed volumes. These are, one on the "Passion of our Lord," and the other on the "Lament of Mary," both printed with the Lenten sermons. The latter of these is about five times as long as the usual sermon, and the former nearly ten times. It is an interesting fact, however, that the sermon on the "Passion" is divided into six sections of approximately equal length, each one being, therefore, not so very much longer than the longest of the other sermons. As a whole, it contains about 15,000 words, and being so much longer than the longest of the sermons in the series, it raises the question whether the latter are, in fact, so much sermons as sermon abstracts, as they and similar sermons by other authors of the times are often described to be. On the other hand, the shorter sermons have all the appearance, short and meaty as they are, of finished sermons, and are grouped, not one sermon a day, but at least two, and at times four or five and even more. Doubtless the preaching in that day consisted, as the visitor to the cathedral in Genoa finds it to-day, in a series of sermons, or parts, ten or fifteen minutes long and separated by intervals of two or three minutes, during which the preacher sits to rest or kneels for silent prayer. Both the breaks in the long sermon and the groups of short ones are doubtless to be explained on this ground. It may also be that the shorter sermons were expanded on occasion, especially in popular preaching, or they may, like those of Robertson, be the condensations from longer extemporaneous sermons. It may quite likely be, however, that, whether preached by himself or read by someone else to the Brothers, the sermons were delivered precisely in their published form when preached to the Religious. It will be remembered that Voragine often in his sermons deprecates, severely at times, all loquaciousness, redundancy and repetition, and, after all, the length of the average sermon is about that of the alleged imperial German rule for the ideal sermon, *i.e.*, eight to twelve minutes.

Besides his sermons Voragine made at least three contributions to sermon writing: a treatise, or at least chapters, on the art of preaching, a treatise on the art of speaking and a book of pulpit aids.

The writers on Voragine mention a treatise on the art of preaching, but put it among those works ascribed whose existence is

doubtful. There are, however, two works in manuscript which, if they do not exactly correspond to this title, at least, taken together, cover the ground. Both of these are at Florence, and one of them is in the same manuscript with the Visitation sermons. This one has no heading. The contents are various and may include two or three works—the Gospel History, *e.g.*, as well as the art of preaching. In any event, it has chapters “On preaching—What sort is pleasing to God and what sort to the devil,” “On the usefulness of preaching,” “On the nature of preaching as it should be,” “On those who listen to preaching.” The other work is extremely interesting as the only known work in Italian which is probably written in the vernacular by Voragine and bears his name as author as well. His authorship of the Italian Bible has been doubted, and at any event we have no evidence to connect him with existing translations. The Golden Legend was translated into Italian at a date very early, perhaps as early as during his lifetime, but we have no evidence that he was the translator. But this treatise, “A Short Theory of Elocution” (*Brevis doctrina de modo loquendi*), is in archaic Italian, with his name as author, and is bound with another short work, probably by him, also in Italian, whose illustrations, taken in connection with the handwriting, point to as early a date as perhaps his own lifetime, and, unless there is evidence to the contrary, may, with his reputation for elegant Italian, be supposed to have been composed by him in Italian. The title is in Latin, but the text is Italian and treats of six things which are to be considered by a speaker: 1. Who art thou that speakest; 2. What wouldest thou say; 3. To whom thou art to speak; 4. The reason why; 5. How thou wouldest and shouldst speak; 6. The time of speaking.

The book of sermon aids is number four in that same Florentine manuscript to which reference has been made. It is called a “Book of motetts which may be introduced into and mingled with sermons, at the discretion of the preacher.” There are fifty-eight topics “On goodness,” “On almsgiving,” “On wealth,” etc. It does not appear from the brief notes made just what the nature of this work is. It can hardly be the motett proper, and one can only guess whether it is a collection of quotations or illustrations, but it would seem clear that it would fall somewhere under the head of pulpit aids.

The spirit of his preaching and his teaching regarding preaching comes up here and there in the sermons. He says, for example, “three things commend a preacher—a holy life, unflagging teaching, and an instructed and numerous spiritual progeny.” Again he

says, "the Holy Spirit descended on the apostles in tongues of flame, because a preacher must have a tongue of flame for inflaming." Again he rebukes those "lazy preachers" who do not have the words of God in their mouths for preaching, but hide them in their hearts through laziness and inertia.

Whatever may be the fact regarding the intrinsic merit of Voragine's sermons judged by the canons of taste of our own time, or their relative merit to those of other preachers of the olden times, two facts stand out distinctly: (1) The sermons were, beyond a doubt, uncommonly popular in his own time and for centuries afterward, and (2) they were, it is well established, practically effective for a great movement in the "reformation of morals," and to the point of constraining passionate men to lay aside their quarrels.

Looking for the secret of this effectiveness, it is to be noted in the first place that, like most very effective preaching, it was intensely Scriptural in its character. It is true that the preachers of his time were generally rich in Scripture quotation;—they were the more effective for that, each in proportion to the richness and skill of application. Voragine certainly excelled both in quantity and skill of use. There is in his sermons, on an average, a Scripture quotation in every eighty words, at times even thirty words. If it be true that he translated the Bible into Italian, his mastery of texts from every book in the Bible is not surprising, especially in view of his manifest and recorded prodigious memory for quotation in general.

It is said of him that he committed to memory all the works of Augustine—a statement to be taken with a large grain of allowance when it is remembered that he himself made a whole, if little, book of what is not more than a bibliographical list of Augustine's works. But he undoubtedly did have a remarkable command of his works for quotation, and a hardly less facile command of a prodigious range of sacred and secular writings. A second element of his effectiveness may therefore be said to be the range and aptitude of his quotations.

Again, something may be said for his free and apt use of anecdote, metaphor and simile. His anecdotes, like his quotations, are always pat and often have a flavor of humor which may well justify Father Barry's passing description of him as "the witty Jacobus da Voragine." It is a familiar fact that the allegorical style and all use of figures is effective in popular preaching.

No doubt, too, another element was the variety of his style. A glance at the examples of sermons mentioned above shows his

versatility in this regard, and this feature was, no doubt, then as now, one of the secrets of holding popular attention.

But when everything has been said in favor of illustration, neither quotation nor anecdote nor figure of any sort is in itself fundamental. Sermons may have all of these elements and be dull to the verge of boredom, or have none of them and yet be interesting and effective. As a matter of fact, many of the sermons of Voragine are quite without illustration save Scripture quotation, and yet have power and even charm in high degree. The essence of Voragine's power must therefore be sought within these narrowest limits of the sermon without illustration.

It is probable that the clearness of outline and subdivisions which brought on him the reproach of scholasticism may have contributed something to effectiveness, but this certainly does not explain charm.

In the last analysis the secret lies, and must lie, in that "style which is the man." Of this style two or three elements may be analyzed out—to be interpreted in the light of the man's own character, which is the secret weight behind all words.

One element of this style is to be found in clearness and the suppression of the superfluous. That redundancy which is the commonest reproach of the layman against the pulpit is almost utterly absent. He says a thing and then lets go of it. It may be said that this is because these are condensed sermons, but the same thing is true of his style in his longest ones, and he frequently preaches the doctrine. It is fair, therefore, to say that this quality is both real and conscious.

Closely allied with this freedom from repetitiousness is the terseness of his language, which has frequently almost the value of epigram.

But the secret of secrets probably lies in the directness and unaffected naturalness of his speech, or what a recent writer on the Golden Legend calls its naïveté—its simplicity, in short. It is doubtful if analysis of style can go further than this. If a man has this he has style. With simplicity of speech a man tells for what he is. His very self flows out in his words.

It is worth while noting, therefore, what manner of man the preacher himself was. A remarkable executive, Provincial, Archbishop, diplomat, the chief glory of Voragine in the eyes of posterity is that he was Peacemaker. As such, beatified, he is invoked in the Roman Church to-day. Learned to the extreme, Master at least, and Professor, nicknamed The Theologian on account

of his learning, his own great zeal was for the reformation of morals; he became master of the language of the common people in order to reach them, he wrote the Golden Legend and the Virtues and Vices for them and not for the learned, he parted with his Countship of San Remo for their sakes, and in time of famine sold even his necessary furniture for their relief. The spirit of the man appears in his sermons. Although belonging rather to the practical than to the mystical tendency he is constantly speaking of "being inflamed with love for Christ," "for love is a fire." "Love is strong as fire; it inflames love, inflames word, inflames deed." "Wholly inflamed with the love of God." Of loving one's enemies he says, "If any one shall pray for all the faithful and from those general prayers exclude his enemies, he is not in a state of salvation"; and again, "For the perfect should pray for their enemies, not merely in a general way but specifically." His work as peacemaker was merely the carrying out of his own precepts. He is never tired of preaching forbearance and humility, which may possibly be characterized as his favorite theme, although he is not therefore a "peace at any price" man by any means. "The water of the Holy Spirit," he says, "flows not in the mountains of the proud, but in the valley of the humble"; "The way to meet the angry is to be patient, to keep silent, to answer with pacific words, to leave them, to confer benefits on them"; "The duty of a bishop is to chastise the erring, cherish the good, pacify the quarrelsome, encourage the timorous"; "The prelate ought always to humble himself in all things before God," and to be humble in the presence of all men save of the proud whose pride it is his duty to break. He is not indifferent to the duty of chastising the erring and rebuking the proud, and he faithfully rebukes the lazy and erring among his friars and those heretics "who have more faith in fables than in the divine word."

When it is said that a man of imagination and humor has burning love, deep humility and uncompromising hatred of pride and sloth, what more can be said of his character? The man behind the words of these sermons is a man burning with love to God, tender toward his fellow-men, loving peace and the middle way, but hating oppression and evil, and, above all, having that rare "touch" with the real people's people which only a man of imagination and humor, love, humility and toleration can have.

The best way to get an idea of Voragine's preaching is to read a sermon in full. The following from the Lenten series is therefore given as showing several of his styles. Without being anything

very exceptional, it gives a fair idea of the average length and style:

*The third day of the first week, the first sermon, in which it is shown that the Church is built for God to dwell in and for man to pray in.* The text is Matt. xxi. 13: "My house shall be called the house of prayer." Whenever our Lord went up to Jerusalem He used to go at once to the temple, thereby teaching us that when we go to any place we ought at once to go to church. When He went into the temple He cast out thence all those who bought or sold. The priests had from avarice allowed sheep and oxen and doves to be sold in the porch of the temple, in order that none might be obliged to omit sacrifices for lack of a victim. And since perhaps some might not have the right change for buying, they set up money-changers to provide it for them. But Christ having made a whip of small cords drove them all out. As Saint Jerome says: "Among all the miracles that Christ did this was the mightiest, that one man should have the power to cast out sellers and buyers and overturn the tables of the money-changers and the seats of those who sold doves; and it is a marvel that the Jews allowed these things to be done. Concerning this Jerome says, that from the face of Christ proceeded a certain wonderful dazzling brightness which terrified all so that they did not dare contradict Him.

Nowhere else but here do we read of His inflicting punishment. He often heard things which He disapproved, often bore wrongs, but never sought to punish the aggressors save here. And the reason is that the other wrongs were against Him, therefore he was unwilling to punish. This, however, was a wrong done His Father and therefore He punished it sternly, to teach us that we ought to forgive our own wrongs but severely to punish God's wrongs. We, however, generally do just the opposite since, we take little heed to God's wrongs while we relentlessly avenge our own.

It was when Christ was casting out the sheep and oxen from the temple that He uttered the words of the text, "My house shall be called the house of prayer." From this text it is to be understood that the Church of God is built for a double purpose—first, for God to dwell in (and therefore He says "My house," i.e., chosen by Me for a dwelling place) and then for man to pray in (and therefore it is added it shall be called the house of prayer).

The Church is therefore the house of God because He dwells in it, as it is said, (2 Chron. viii) "For now have I chosen and hallowed this house, that my name may be there forever, and mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually. My eyes also shall be open and my ears outstretched to the prayer of him who shall pray in this place." From these words it is to be understood that God puts in the Church His name, His heart, His eyes and His ears. He places His *name* there: since He wishes it to take its name from Him. For as the house in which the proud dwell may be called the house of Lucifer, and the house in which usurers dwell the house of Mammon, and the house where the immoral live the house of Asmodeus, and as taverns may be called the house of Beelzebub, since where there is much food there will be swarms of flies, so the house in which the faithful dwell and the devout gather together is called the house of God: (Gen. xxviii) "This is none other than the house of God."

In the second place God puts His *heart* in the Church, that is His love. And therefore He takes it very ill when any one does anything forbidden there, as is evident from this occasion when he cast out of the temple the sellers and buyers. We read in the histories that Pompey converted the porch of God's temple into a stable for his horses, and whereas up to this time he had always been victorious over his enemies, he never afterward fought without being beaten.

*Third.* God puts His *eyes* in the Church: with these He beholds the knees bowed in prayer and the almsgivings, and with these also He sees displays of

ornaments and vanities. As Ambrose says, "He who would be heard in prayer let him lay aside display before he bows himself, that he may provoke God's compassion. For proud attire neither obtains anything nor gains ready approval. The more, *e.g.*, a woman seems to human eyes to be splendid the more she is displeasing to God." We read that when Esther, the queen, adorned and painted herself to please King Ahasuerus, she, on the contrary, drove the King into a rage, but with her ruddy color changed to paleness she pleased him. So it is that when a woman paints her face she offends God, but when she takes no thought of her face she pleases God.

*Fourth.* God puts His *ears* in the Church, in that with them He hears the prayers of the devout: "I heard thy prayers and I saw thy tears" (Isa. xxxviii). With His ears He also hears the words of the backbiters. We read of St. Sixtus, Bishop of Genoa, that once upon a time, when he was in church, he was provoked to loud laughter, saying that he had seen a demon who was writing down the words of those who were talking in church. And when the vellum gave out and he tried to lengthen it with his teeth, the sheet broke suddenly and his head struck the wall so violently that the sound of the collision could be heard and his head was cut open.

He hears also those priests and monks who sing carelessly and omit from the service many Psalms and readings. We read that a certain holy monk saw a certain demon named Titivillus running about among the monk's benches and apparently gathering up something and putting it in a sack. On demand of the holy man, he said he was collecting the omissions from the Psalms, and that he was accustomed to fill his sack one thousand times every single day. Wherefore some one has made out of these verses after this fashion:

"Fragments of the Psalms,  
Titivillus collects of them,  
Daily a thousand  
Times he loads himself."

In the second place the Church is built for worship, for God willingly hears the prayers of the faithful praying in the Church—wherefore it is said, "Whosoever shall pray in this place, let him be heard from thy dwellingplace" (2 Chron. vi). Nevertheless (Beda says) from three causes it happens that prayers are not heard—

1. When we ask unworthy things, that is, things which are not seemly or good for us to have. Such are temporal things. As Chrysostom says, "Seek those things from God which are expedient for you to have, and befitting for Him to give." If, moreover, you always ask earthly things, either you will get them with difficulty, or perchance will not get them at all. For wherefore shall He willingly give to you, who have them not, those things which, if you should have, He would admonish you to despise. We read in the fables of the poets that Midas the king sought from his god Apollo that whatever he should touch should become gold, and his prayer was granted him. When, therefore, he would touch food or drink with his hands or his lips, at once it would be turned into gold and he died of hunger. By this we are given to understand that the avaricious man always desires riches, which nevertheless are the cause of his death, as it is said, "Those who wish to become rich fall into divers temptations and into the snare of the devil, and into many and hurtful lusts which sink man to destruction and perdition."

2. Prayers are not heard when we seek unworthily, *i.e.*, while committing any crime: (Es. i. 15) "When ye make many prayers I will not hear: your hands are full of blood"; (Lam. iii. 44) "Thou hast covered thyself with a cloud that our prayer shall not pass through"; (Zech. v. 7) "And he cast the weight of lead upon the mouth of the ephah and he said, this is wickedness." From these we

gather that sin is like blood, like a cloud, and like lead. Since, then, sin is like blood it therefore defiles prayer, so that one may not dare appear before the face of the Lord. Since, moreover, sin is like a cloud therefore it darkens prayer, and one is unable to proceed upon the way of the Lord. Since, finally, sin is like lead, therefore it weighs down prayer so that it cannot rise to heaven.

3. Our prayers are not heard because we pray for sinners who are still sinning: (Jo. ix) "Now we know that God heareth not sinners"; (Jer. xv. 1) "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people."

We read in the *Lives of the Fathers* an illustration of this: that when a certain friar was sorely tempted and a certain holy man prayed for him and yet the temptation did not leave him, the holy father saw in a revelation from God that Asmodeus was showing himself in various shapes before that brother and he, so far from resisting, welcomed them. He saw also an angel chiding the brother because he did not resist and because he did not help himself. Then the father said to that brother, "I have found the reason why the prayers which I have offered for you have not been heard: it is because you are not worthy. You ought therefore to help yourself, to discipline your body and to resist temptations." When the friar had done this he was cured.

Princeton, N. J.

E. C. RICHARDSON.

## V.

# ROYAL TITLES IN ANTIQUITY: AN ESSAY IN CRITICISM.

### ARTICLE Two.

THE following article is the second of a series, whose design is to show that the statements made by Dr. Driver in his *Literature of the Old Testament* with regard to the titles of the kings of Persia cannot be "accepted unqualifiedly, and that the impression left by his notes and proofs is misleading and fallacious." In the first article, which occupied pages 257-282 of the April number of this REVIEW, after giving a full citation of Dr. Driver's remarks and notes upon the subject, the author proceeded to give an enumeration of all the known titles and designations of the kings of Persia. In the present article will appear the titles and designations of the kings of Babylon and Assyria, as they are found on the cuneiform monuments.

#### I. THE TITLES OF THE KINGS OF BABYLON.

##### A. ON THE MONUMENTS FOUND IN PERSIA.

Here no mention is made of the kings of Babylon, except in the Behistun inscription, where Darius represents the rebels against his authority as giving themselves the following titles, to wit:

1. Nadintubel says: "I am Nebuchadnezar, the son of Nabunâ'id." So also Arahū says.
2. Nadintubel says: "I am king in Babylon."

##### B. ON THE MONUMENTS FOUND IN BABYLONIA, ASSYRIA, ETC.\*

1. "Urukagina, king of Girsu." *K. B.*, III. i. 11.
2. (1) "Urnina, king of Lagaš." *K. B.*, III. i. 15.
- (2) "U., king of Lagaš, son of Nigalnidu." III. i. 11, 15
3. (1) "Akurgal, king of Lagaš, son of Urnina." *Id.*, 17.
- (2) "A., the governor . . ." *Id.*, 17

\* Here we shall make large use of the historical and other texts published in transliteration and translation in the *Keilschriftliche Bibliothek* (*K. B.*), the latest, fullest and best source of information upon the subject.

4. (1) "Gudea, governor of Lagaš." *Id.*, 27, 39, 43, 47, 51, 55, 59, 61, 63, 65 *bis*, 67.  
 (2) "Gudea, 'Schatzspender,' governor of Lagaš." *Id.*, 29.  
 (3) "Gudea" alone. *Id.*, 29, 41, 55.  
 (4) "Gudea, governor of Lagaš, the 'Schatzspender,' and pilot(?) of Enlil." *Id.*, 51.
5. (1) "Ur-Ningirsu, governor of Lagaš, the son of Gudea, the governor of Lagaš." *Id.*, 67.  
 (2) "U.-N., . . . . priest of Anna." *Id.*, 67.
6. (1) "Dingi, the powerful man, the king of Ur." *Id.*, 69.  
 (2) "D., the mighty king, the king of Ur, the king of Šumer and Akkad." *Id.*, 71, 81<sup>5</sup>, 83<sup>2</sup>.  
 (3) "Dungi" alone. *Id.*, 83.  
 (4) "D., the mighty hero, the king of Ur." *Id.*, 83.  
 (5) "D., the mighty, the king of Ur, the king of the four regions." *Id.*, 83.
7. (1) "Urgur, the king of Ur." *Id.*, 77<sup>2</sup>, 79, 81.  
 (2) "U., the brave hero, king of Ur." *Id.*, 77, 81.  
 (3) "U., the brave hero, the king of Ur, the king of Šumer and Akkad." *Id.*, 79<sup>4</sup>.  
 (4) "U., the king of Ur, the king of Šumer and Akkad." *Id.*, 69.
8. (1) "Singašid, son of Ningul, king of Uruk." *Id.*, 83.  
 (2) "S., the brave hero, king of Uruk, king of Amnanu." *Id.*, 83.  
 (3) "S., king of Uruk, king of Amnanu, the preserver of Eanna." *Id.*, 85.
9. "Singamil, king of Uruk." *Id.*, 85.
10. "Bilgurahi, king of Uruk." *Id.*, 85.
11. "Gamil-Ninib, the exalted shepherd of Nippur and Ur, the conjurer of the holy tree(?) of Eridu, the gracious lord of Uruk, king of Isin, king of Šumer and Akkad, the chosen husband of Nana." *Id.*, 85.
12. "Lubit-Ištar, the . . . . shepherd of Nippur, the . . . . of Ur, the . . . . of Eridu, the . . . . lord of Uruk, king of Isin, the . . . . of Nana." *Id.*, 87.
13. "Išbigirra, king of Isin." *Id.*, 87.
14. (1) "Išme-Dagan" alone. *Id.*, 87.  
 (2) "I.-D., king of Šumer and Akkad." *Id.*, 87.  
 (3) "I.-D., renewer of Nippur, prince of Ur, addadu(?) of Eridu, lord of Uruk, king of Isin, king of Šumer and Akkad, the beloved husband of Nana." *Id.*, 87.
15. "Gungunu, the brave hero, the king of Ur." *Id.*, 87.
16. "Enannaduma, the beloved lord of Nannar, the lord of

Nannar, the . . . . of Ur, the son of Išme-Dagan, the king of Šumer and Akkad." *Id.*, 87.

17. (1) "Bursin, called by Bel in Nippur to be sak-uš of the temple of Bel, the mighty king, the king of Ur, the king of the four regions." *Id.*, 89 *bis*.

(2) Same as last except *nītah*, "hero," instead of *lugal*, "king." *Id.*, 89.

18. (1) "Gamil-Sin, the darling of Bel, the king of Nippur, called to be the darling of his heart, the mighty king, the king of Ur, the king of the four regions." *Id.*, 89.

(2) "Gamil-Sin, the brave hero, the king of Ur, the king of the four regions." *Id.*, 91 *bis*.

19. (1) "Nur-Ramman, the mighty hero, . . . . of Ur, king of Larsa." *Id.*, 91.

(2) "N.-R., king of Larsa." *Id.*, 91.

20. (1) "Sin-iddina, the brave hero, the upholder of Ur, king of Larsa, king of Šumer and Akkad," etc., "son of Nur-Ramman, king of Larsa." *Id.*, 91.

(2) Same as last, minus the last clause. *Id.*, 93.

21. (1) "Kudur-Mabug, prince of Emutbal, son of Simtišilhak." *Id.*, 99.

(2) "Kudur-Mabug, prince of the West, son of Simtišilhak" *Id.*, 93.

(3) "K.-M., the prince of Emuthala." *Id.*, 95.

(4) "K.-M., the father. . . . ." *Id.*, 99.

22. (1) "Rimsin, his (*i.e.*, Kudur-Mabug's) son." *Id.*, 93.

(2) "Rimsin, the brave hero, installed by Bel, the legitimate prince, the upholder of Ur, the king of Larsa, the king of Šumer and Akkad, the son of Kudurmabug, the prince of Emutbala." *Id.*, 95.

(3) "Rim-Sin, the ruler of the totality of men, the . . . . of Eridu, . . . . the upholder of Ur, King of Larsa, king of Šumer and Akkad." *K. B.*, III. 95.

(4) "Rim-Sin, king of Larsa." *K. B.*, III. 95 *bis*, 97.

(5) "Rim-Sin" alone. *K. B.*, III. 93, 97, 99.

(6) "My king Rim-Sin, upholder of I-kurra, the powerful ruler of Igīšsirgal, the honorable minister of Ibarra, the enchanter of the holy tree of Eridu." *K. B.*, III. 97.

(7) "Rim-Sin, his son, the exalted Shepherd of Nippur, the upholder of Ur, king of Larsa, king of Šumer and Akkad." *K. B.*, III. 99.

23. (1) "Naram-Sin, king of the four regions." *K. B.*, III. 99.

(2) "Naram-Sin" alone. *Id.*, 107 *bis*.

24. "Sargon-šar-mahazi, king of Agani." *K. B.*, III. 101 *bis*.
25. "MA-AN-ištu-irba, king of the nations (šar kiššati)." *Id.*, 101.
26. (1) "Sargon, the mighty king, king of Agane, am I." *K. B.*, III. 101.  
(2) "Sargon" alone. *K. B.*, III. 103, 105, 107, eleven times.
27. Titles of Hammurabi:
  - (1) "Hammurabi" alone. So in the fifty-five letters published by King in *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*. They all, so far as they are legible, contain the phrase: "Thus saith Hammurabi." The name is found alone in Inscription No. IX, King, vol. III. 194; also in Scheil, *Code des Lois de Hammurabi*, p. 120.
  - (2) "Hammurabi the king." *K. B.*, III. 109, 123, 127 *bis*, 129 *ter*, 131 *bis*.
  - (3) "Hammurabi, the mighty king." King, III. 194.
  - (4) "Hammurabi, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the king of the four quarters, the founder of the land, the king whose deeds are well-pleasing unto the heart of Šamaš and Marduk." King, III. 179; *K. B.*, III. 117.
  - (5) "Hammurabi, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, who hath brought to subjection the four quarters of the world, who hath brought about the triumphs of Marduk, the shepherd who delighteth his heart." King, III. 190; *K. B.*, III. 123.
  - (6) "Hammurabi, the mighty king, the beloved of the great gods." King, III. 191; *K. B.*, III. 125.
  - (7) "Hammurabi, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the king of the four quarters of the world." King, III. 183; *K. B.*, III. 111.
  - (8) "Hammurabi, the king, the strong warrior, the destroyer of his foes." etc. King, III. 176; *K. B.*, III. 115.
  - (9) "Hammurabi, the minister of Anu, the servant of Bel, the beloved of Šamaš, the shepherd who delighteth Marduk's heart, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the king of Šumer and Akkad, the king of the four quarters of the world," etc. King, III. 182. Also found in another inscription. King III. 187; *K. B.*, III. 125.
  - (10) Same as last, except that it inserts after Marduk's "heart," "the prince who is dear to the heart of Ninni." King, III. 185.
  - (11) "Hammurabi, the prince in whom Bel taketh delight, the beloved shepherd of Ninib, the reverend one who showeth obedience unto Šamaš and maketh glad the heart of Marduk, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the humble and reverend one," etc. King, III. 193; *K. B.*, 121.

(12) "Hammurabi, the founder of the land, the king whose deeds are well pleasing unto the heart of Šamaš and Marduk." King, III. 179; *K. B.*, III. 119.

(13) "Hammurabi, the king of Martu," etc. King, III. 196.

(14) "Hammurabi, the great, the noble, fearing my god," etc. Scheil, *Code des Lois de Hammurabi*, in *Mémoires de la Delegation en Perse*, Tome IV. 16.

(15) "Hammurabi, the valiant king." *Id.*, page 117.

(16) "Hammurabi, king of justice(?)" [šar mišarim]. *Id.*, 123.

28. (1) "Samsu-iluna, the king of his (*i.e.*, Bel's) abundance." King, III. 205; *K. B.*, III. 131.

(2) "Samsu-iluna," son of the just named. *K. B.*, II. 286.

(3) "Samsu-iluna, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the king who hath brought into subjection the four quarters of the world." King, III. 205; *K. B.*, III. 131, 133.

29. "Ibišum," son of the just named. *K. B.*, II. 286.

30. (1) "Ammiditana, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, king of Kiš, king of Šumer and Akkad, king (dagamu) of the land of Martu," etc. King, III. 208.

(2) "Ammisatana," son of the just named. *K. B.*, II. 286.

31. (1) "Ammizaduga, the mighty king, king of Babylon."

(2) "Ammisurduḡga," son of the just named. *K. B.*, II. 286.

32. In the chronicle of the kings of the first dynasty of Babylon, published by King, in vol. III. 211-253, the following titles occur:

(1) The title alone, probably on page 245.

(2) The name alone: Sumuabu, p. 213; Sumula-ilu, pp. 215, 217 bis, 219 ter; Zabum, p. 221 ter; Apil-Sin, p. 223; Simmuballit, pp. 225 bis, 227; Hammurabi, pp. 229, 233, 235, 237, 253; Samsu-iluna, pp. 241, 242, 243 bis, 253; Ammiditana, pp. 251, 253<sup>6</sup>; Abišu, p. 253; Ammizaduga, p. 253.

(3) Name followed by title, to wit: "Sumu-abu, the king," p. 215; "Sumula-ilu, the king," p. 221; "Zabum, the king," p. 223; "Apil-Sin, the king," p. 225; "Sin-muballit, the king," p. 229; "Hammurabi, the king," p. 240 bis, 241 four times; "Samsu-iluna, the king," p. 247; "Ammiditana, the king," pp. 248 ter, 249 ter, 250 bis, 253 bis; "Ammizaduga, the king," *Id.*

(4) Further, the Samsu-iluna (mentioned by King, pages 241, etc.) speaks of his ancestor as "Sumula-ilu, my grandfather, the fifth father of my father." [Su-mu-la-ilu, abi ra-bi-um abi a-bi(?)ia ha-am-šum. *K. B.*, III. 132.] See King, pages 215, 217 bis, 219 bis.

33. (1) "Agum, the younger, son of Taššigurumaš, illustrious

seed of Šukaimunu, called of Anu and Bel, Ea and Marduk, Sin and Šamaš, a powerful hero of Ištar, a king of prudence and understanding, a king of obedience and grace, son of Tašsigurumaš, grandson of Abiru ? ? ?, firstborn son of Agum the elder, illustrious seed, royal seed, holder of the scepter(?) ? ?, shepherd of numerous men, warrior shepherd, establishing the foundations of his father's throne, am I, the king of the Kassites and Akkad, king of the great land of Babylon, settling the land of Ašnunak with numerous men, king of the land of Padan and Alman, king of the land of Guti, of the foolish(?) people, a king who holds in order the four quarters of the world, a favorite of the great gods, am I.” *K. B.*, III. 135–139.

- (2) “The king Agum.” *K. B.*, III. 149.
- (3) “The good (damki) king Agum.” *Id.*, 151.
- (4) “Agum” alone. Perhaps in Col. VIII, line 25, *K. B.*, III. 151.

34. (1) “Karaindaš, the mighty king, king of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, king of the Kassites, king of Karduniaš.” *K. B.*, III. i. 152.

- (2) “Karaindaš, king of Karduniaš.” II. R. 65, No. 1, line 1.
- (3) “Kuraindaš” alone. Tel-el-Amarna, No. 8, l. 8, Winckler’s edition.

35. (1) “Kurigalzu” alone. Tel-el-Amarna, No. 7, l. 19.  
 (2) This king is called by Burraburiaš, “my father, Kurigalzu.”  
 (3) Merodach-Baladan calls himself the “descendant of Kurigalzu, the incomparable king.”

36. (1) “Burnaburiaš” (or “Burraburiaš”) alone. *K. B.*, V. 29.  
 (2) “B., king of Karduniaš.” *Id.*, 15, 17, 19, 23, 27; also, Vol. I, page 95.

(3) “B., the mighty king, king of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad.” *K. B.*, I. 153.

Note: The following two kings come in here. One of them, at least, was a usurper

1. “Karahardaš, king of Karduniaš.” *K. B.*, I. 195, 197.
2. (1) “Nazibugaš, king of Karduniaš.” *K. B.*, I. 197.  
 (2) “Nazibugaš” [son of a nobody]. *K. B.*, I. 195.
37. (1) “Kurigalzu” alone. *K. B.*, V. 21.  
 (2) “K., my father.” *K. B.*, V. 17.  
 (3) “K., son of Burnaburiaš.” *K. B.*, I. 197, III. 155.  
 (4) “K., šakkanak of Bel.” *K. B.*, III. 155.  
 (5) “K., šakkanak of Bel, the mighty king, the king of Šumer and Akkad, the king of the four quarters of the world.” *K. B.*, III. 155 *bis*.

- (6) "The young Kurgalzu, son of Burnaburiaš." *K. B.*, I. 197.  
 (7) "Kurigalzu, the younger" [king of Karduniaš]. *K. B.*, I. 197.  
 38. (1) "Nazimarraddaš" alone. *K. B.*, I. 197.  
 (2) "N., king of Karduniaš." *K. B.*, I. 197.  
 39. (1) "Ramman . . ." (?). *K. B.*, I. 197; "Ramman-šumiddin." *K. B.*, III. 163.  
 (2) "King Ramman-šumiddin." *K. B.*, III. 155 eight times,  
 157 four times.  
 (3) "The king." *K. B.*, III. 157 three times.  
 40. (1) "King Rammannadinahi." *K. B.*, III. 159 *bis*, 157  
 four times.  
 (2) "Rammannadinahi" alone. *K. B.*, III. 163.  
 (3) "The King." *K. B.*, III. 157 *bis*, 159. ("The king," in a  
 general sense, occurs on page 163 twice.)  
 41. (1) "King Milišihu." *K. B.*, III. 161 five times.  
 (2) "Milišihu" alone. *K. B.*, III. 163, II. 286.  
 (3) "The king." *K. B.*, III. 161, IV. 59.  
 (4) "Milišihu, king of nations" (*šar kiššati*). *K. B.*, IV. 59.  
 (5) "Milišihu, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. 163.  
 42. (1) "Mardukapluiddin (Merodach-Baladan), king of nations,  
 king of Šumer and Akkad, son of Milišihu, king of Babylon, descend-  
 ant of Kurigalzu, the incomparable king." *K. B.*, III. 163.  
 (2) "Lord Merodach-Baladan." *K. B.*, IV. 63.  
 (3) "Merodach-Baladan, his son" (*i.e.*, Milišihu's). *K. B.*, II. 286.  
 43. "Zamemu-šum-iddin, king of Karduniaš." *K. B.*, I. 197.  
 44. "Marduk-tabik-zerim, king of Babylon, the mighty king,  
 king of the nations of mankind, king of the four quarters of the  
 world." *K. B.*, III. 163.  
 45. (1) "King Nebuchadnezzar." *K. B.*, III. 167.  
 (2) "Nebuchadnezzar" alone. *K. B.*, III. 163, 199 *bis*.  
 (3) "The king." *K. B.*, III. 165, 167 *ter*, 171 four times.  
 (4) "Nebuchadnezzar, the king." *K. B.*, III. 173 four times.  
 (5) "Nebuchadnezzar, the king of nations." *K. B.*, III. 169.  
 (6) "Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. 173, IV.  
 65.  
 (7) "The powerful king" (*šarru dannu*). *K. B.*, III. 167.  
 (8) "The king, his lord." *K. B.*, III. 167 *ter*.  
 (9) "The king, his lord, Nebuchadnezzar." *K. B.*, III. 167.  
 (10) "Nebuchadnezzar, the exalted prince, the precious offspring  
 of Babylon, the noblest of kings, the heroic patisi, the šakkanak  
 of Babylon, the sun of his land, who enriches his people, protects

the frontiers, firmly founds the sons(?), the king of right things, who gives righteous judgment, the heroic man, who mustered his forces to join battle, who bears the strong bow, fears not the battle, cast down with his weapons the mighty Tullubian land, conqueror of Aharriland, plunderer of the Kassites, the prince of kings (nasik šarrâni), the princely, beloved of Marduk." *K. B.*, III. 165.

- 46. (1) "Beladinaplu, the king." *K. B.*, IV. 65.
- (2) "The king." *K. B.*, IV. 67.
- (3) "The king, his lord, Belnadinaplu." *K. B.*, IV. 65.
- 47. (1) "Marduknadinahî, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, I. 199, IV. 67, 69 four times, 75.
  - (2) "The king." *K. B.*, IV. 67, 69.
  - (3) "The king of Babylon." *K. B.*, IV. 67 bis, 75.
  - (4) "Marduknadinahî, king of Akkad." *K. B.*, II. 119.
- 48. "Mardukšapikkullat, king of Karduniaš." *K. B.*, I. 199 bis.
- 49. (1) "Rammanapluiddina" alone. *K. B.*, I. 199.
  - (2) "R., king of Karduniaš." *K. B.*, I. 199.
- 50. "Šamašmudammik, king of Karduniaš." *K. B.*, I. 201 ter.
- 51. (1) "Nabušumiškun" alone. *K. B.*, I. 201.
  - (2) "N., king of Karduniaš." *K. B.*, I. 201.
- 52. (1) "Nabukinaplu, king of nations, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, IV. 89.
  - (2) "N., the king." *K. B.*, IV. 83, 85, 87 four times, 89.
  - (3) "N., king of nations." *K. B.*, IV. 89.
- 53. (1) "Ninibkuduruşur, the king." *K. B.*, IV. 87 bis, 91 ter, 93.
  - (2) "N., son of the king." *K. B.*, IV. 91.
- 54. (1) "Nabuapluiddin, the king, his lord." *K. B.*, IV, 93, III. 179, 189.
  - (2) "The king." *K. B.*, IV. 93, III. 181 four times.
  - (3) "Nabuapluiddin, the king." *K. B.*, IV. 93; *Cun. Texts of Brit. Museum*, Vol. X, No. 90,922.
  - (4) "N., the king of Babylon." *K. B.*, I. 201 bis. IV. 95 bis, 97, III. 177, 179 four times, 181 bis, 183; *Cun. Texts of Brit. Mus.*, X. 90,922 bis.
  - (5) "N., the king of Babylon, the chosen of Marduk, the beloved of Anu and Ea, winner of the heart of Zarpanitu, the heroic man, who is adorned for government, bearer of the strong bow," etc.
- 55. (1) "Mardukšumiddin, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, IV. 97, III. 183.
  - (2) "Marduknadinšum." *K. B.*, I. 201.
  - (3) "Marduknadinšum, king of Karduniaš." *K. B.*, I. 201.

56. (1) "Mardukbalatsuiḳbi." *K. B.*, I. 201.  
 (2) "M., king of Karduniaš." *K. B.*, I. 201.
57. (1) "Šulmanu-ašaridu (Shalmanassar), king of Assyria." *K. B.*, III. 183 (IV. 159).  
 (2) "Šulmanašarid." *K. B.*, I. 291.
58. (1) "Šarukin (Sargon), king of Assyria." *K. B.*, III. 183 bis (IV. 161, 165).  
 (2) "Sargon, the king of Babylon." Rm. 2,345, Bezold *Catalogue*, 1669.
59. (1) "Merodach-Baladan (Marduk-aplu-iddina), the king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. 185, 191, 193 *bis*, IV. 167.  
 (2) "Merodach-Baladan" alone. *K. B.*, II. 257, 277 seven times, 279, I. 291.  
 (3) "The king." *K. B.*, III. 193.  
 (4) "Merodach-Baladan, son of Jakin, king of the sea." *K. B.*, II. 15.  
 (5) "Merodach-Baladan, the king of Babylon, the wise prince, king of Šumer and Akkad, worshiper of Nabu and Marduk, the gods of Esaggil and Ezida, etc., etc., etc., the upright shepherd, etc., etc., the exalted prince(?), etc., the mighty hero, etc., etc., the wise prince, etc., called of the king of heaven and earth, lord of lords," etc. *K. B.*, III. 185, 187.  
 (6) "Merodach-Baladan, the king of Babylon, led by his (Marduk's) hand, šakkanak of Šumer and Akkad, worshiper of his godhead." *K. B.*, III. 185.
60. (1) "Esarhaddon" alone. *K. B.*, II. 291.  
 (2) "Esarhaddon, king of nations" (šar kiššati). *K. B.*, IV. 167.  
 (3) "Esarhaddon, the mighty king, king of nations, king of Assyria, šakkanak of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad." *K. B.*, III. i. 197; Lehmann, Table XXVIII, lines 3-5.
61. (1) "Šamaššumukin" alone. *K. B.*, II. 187, 195, 205, 219, 259, 285 *bis*, III. 205. See also in Lehmann's Šamaššumukin: Stele-inschrift S.<sup>3</sup> l. 52; Cylinder-inschrift L.<sup>1</sup> l. 11, P.<sup>1</sup> l. 14, P.<sup>2</sup> l. 13, K. 1203 lines 5 and 23, K. 168 l. 11, K. 626 l. 6, K. 432 Obv. 7, Rev. 2; Cylinderinschrift L.<sup>2</sup> l. 11, II. 19, L.<sup>3</sup> l. 11, II. 21, L.<sup>4</sup> Col. III. 5; Lehmann 27, K. 5579, Lehmann II. 59, and the letter of Šamaššumukin to Ašurbanipal, line 2, Lehmann II. 58.  
 (2) "Šamaššumukin, the king of Babylon." *K. B.*, II. 261, IV. 167, 169, 171. See also Lehmann's Šamaššumukin, S.<sup>3</sup> l. 74, 71 (II. 17), L.<sup>2</sup> lines 21, 22, L.<sup>1</sup> l. 19, P.<sup>1</sup> 23, K. 991 l. 5.  
 (3) "Šamaššumukin, the humble, your worshiper." *K. B.* III. i. 203.

- (4) "Šamaššumukin, the false brother." *K. B.*, II. 183, 185.  
 (5) "S., the hostile brother." *K. B.*, II. 189, 191, 213, 216, 218.  
 (6) "S., the son of the king." Lehmann, Table XLIII. 26.  
 (7) "The son of the king Šamaššumukin." Lehmann, Table XLVI, K. 1118 l. 7.  
 (8) "S., of Babylon." *K. B.*, II. 291.  
 (9) "S., the šakkanak of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad." See the clay brick K. 432, left column 3-5, Lehmann, Tafel XLII.  
 (10) "S., the mighty king, king of Amnanu, king of Babylon, the strong, the thoughtful, the shepherd, favorite of Bel, Šamaš and Marduk, king of the land of the Sumerians and Akkadians, am I." See the Bilingual inscription, Lehmann, II. page 7; *K. B.*, III. 199.  
 (11) "S., the mighty king, king of Babylon, king of the land of the Sumerians and Akkadians, the exalted high priest, the true shepherd, the reverer of the Lord of lords," etc. The Stele inscription, Lehmann, II. 11.  
 (12) This is the same as the last, except that there is doubt, owing to the broken character of the cylinder, as to the reading of the word iššakku, high priest, and the words *siru re'a kinu* may have been different. *K. B.*, III. 197.  
 62. (1) "Ašurbanipal" alone. *K. B.*, IV. 171.  
 (2) "Ašurbanipal of Aššur." *K. B.*, II. 291.  
 (3) "Kandalanu, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, IV. 173.  
 (4) "Kandal" [anu]\* alone. *K. B.*, II. 287.  
 63. (1) "Nabopolassar" alone. So in the tablets published by Strassmaier in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, IV. 106-147. See numbers 8, 10 and 19, 38.  
 (2) "N., the king." *K. B.*, III. ii. 9. See, also, in numbers 4 and 13 of Strassmaier's tablets mentioned under (11).  
 (3) "The king" alone. *K. B.*, III. ii. 7, 9.  
 (4) "N., the king of Babylon." See Strassmaier's tablets, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20; and *K. B.*, III. ii. 47, 53, 81, 33, 39, 61, 67, 69<sup>2</sup>, 71; and Koldewey's *Pflastersteine vom Aiburschabu in Babylon*, all of which seem to have borne this title.  
 (5) "N., the king of nations" (*i.e.*, šar kiššati). *Id.* 15.  
 (6) "N., the king of Babylon, the father, my begetter (banua)." *K. B.*, III. ii. 19, 25 (aladiga), 25.  
 (7) "N., the king of Babylon, led by the hand of Nabu and Marduk." *K. B.*, III. ii. 7.  
 (8) "N., the obedient, the humble, worshiper of the gods." *K. B.*, III. ii. 7.

\* Kandalanu = Ašurbanipal as king of Babylon. See notes in *K. B.*, IV. 170, 171.

(9) Nebuchadnezzar calls him "the father, my begetter." *K. B.*, III. ii. 41.

(10) "N., the mighty king, the king of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, establisher of the foundation of the land, the exalted prince, led by the hand of Nabu and Marduk, the favorite of Šamaš, beloved of Malkatu, hero of ?, to whom Nergal the powerful hath given his dignity, the obedient, the humble, who thinks on the laws (?) of the great gods, the king whose deeds surpass those of the kings his fathers." *K. B.*, III. ii. 9.

(11) "N., šakkanak of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, exalted prince, led by the hand of Nabu and Marduk, the obedient, the humble, who knows how to revere the gods and goddesses, renewer of Esagila(?) and Ezida(?), who cares for the temples of the great gods." etc. *K. B.*, III. ii. 3.

64. (1) "Nebuchadnezzar" alone. Strassmaier, *Insc. von Nabuchodonosor*, 19<sup>11</sup>, 14; I R. 51<sup>29</sup>; contract tablets 6, 31?, 77, 85, 130?, 180, 305.

(2) "The king." *K. B.*, III. ii. 13.

(3) "N., the king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 23, 69, 71, 85; I R. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Also on all of the first 447 tablets published by Strassmaier, except about six; and in Evetts' *Inscriptions of Evil Merodach*, 23<sup>6</sup>, and of Neriglassar, 36<sup>3</sup>. This title seems to have occurred on all the bricks with which Nebuchadnezzar constructed his pavements, and perhaps all his works. See Robert Koldeway's *Die Pflastersteine von Aiburschabu in Babylon*.

(4) "N., the king of Babylon, restorer of Esagila and Ezida." I R. 8, No. 4, and 52, Nos. 5, 6, 7.

(5) "N., king of Babylon, whom Marduk, the great lord, made for a blessing to his city of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 23.

(6) "N., the exalted high priest, the renewer of the cities of the great gods." *K. B.*, III. ii. 37.

(7) Nebuchadnezzar calls himself "the king, the renewer, the rejoicer of thy heart (*i.e.*, Marduk's), the wise šakkanak, renewer of all the cities." *K. B.*, III. ii. 29.

(8) Also: "the firstborn son (*aplu rištu*) of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 57.

(9) "N., king of Babylon, the prince, his worshiper" (*i.e.*, Marduk's). *K. B.*, III. ii. 59.

(10) "N., king of Babylon, the son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 67.

(11) "N., the earlier king." *K. B.*, III. ii. 103.

(12) "N., the earlier king, the son of Nabopolassar." *K. B.*, III. ii. 89.

(13) "N., king of Babylon, the earlier king who preceded me, the son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." Nabunâ'id's great inscription from Ur, col. I. 49, 50.

(14) "N., king of Babylon, the son of Nabopolassar, the earlier king." *K. B.*, III. ii. 85.

(15) "N., king of Babylon, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 61.

(16) "N., king of Babylon, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, princely son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 71.

(17) Same as last, except that aplu ašaridu, "princely son," is omitted. *K. B.*, III. ii. 69.

(18) Same as (16) as far as Ezida inclusive, to which it adds: "who walks in the service of Nabu and Marduk, his lord, the son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 69.

(19) "N., king of Babylon, the obedient, the submissive, the supplicator, worshiper of the lord of lords, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, the legitimate son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 59.

(20) "N., king of Babylon, the obedient, the humble, worshiper of the great gods, exalted high priest (patisi), renewer of Esagila and Ezida, the son of Nabopolassar." *K. B.*, III. ii. 61.

(21) "N., king of rights, the obedient, the submissive, who knows how to worship the gods, who loves righteousness and rights, who cares for life, who places in the mouth of men the fear of the great gods, who puts to right the temples of the gods, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, legitimate son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 63.

(22) "N., king of Babylon, the legitimate ruler (shepherd), the effusion (itut) of the righteous heart of Marduk, the exalted high priest, the beloved of Nabu, the wise prince, whose attention is directed to the ordinances of the great gods, the tireless šakkanak, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, princely son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 53.

(23) "N., the king of rights, the legitimate ruler (shepherd), who rules mankind, directs the lordships of Bel, Šamaš, and Marduk, the thoughtful, who lays hold of wisdom, cares for life, the exalted, unending, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 33.

(24) "N., king of Babylon, the exalted prince, the effusion of the righteous heart of Marduk, the rightful ruler (shepherd), who sets to rights the temple of Nabu, who delights their heart, the exalted high priest, who thinks daily on the renewing of Esagila

and Ezida, and is continually bent on pious works in Babylon and Borsippa, the wise, the suppliant, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, the firstborn son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 57.

(25) "N., king of Babylon, the exalted prince, the favorite of Marduk, the exalted high priest (*patisi širu*), beloved of Nabu, the thoughtful, who lays hold on wisdom, who meditates on the ways of their godhead, fears their lordship, the tireless šakkanak who thinks daily on the renewal of Esagila and Ezida, who meditates continually on the good of Babylon and Borsippa, the wise, the suppliant, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, the princely son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 11.

(26) "N., the king of Babylon, the exalted ruler, favorite of Marduk, exalted high priest, the beloved of Nabu, the tireless, šakkanak, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, obedient to his lords Nabu and Marduk, carried out . . . . , the exalted, who understands the sayings (*ituti*) of the upright mind of the great gods, the princely son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 39.

(27) "N., king of Babylon, the exalted prince, favorite of Marduk, exalted high priest, beloved of Nabu, the upright ruler, who treads upon the peaceful way of Šamaš and Ramman, the wise, the learned, whose attention is directed to the guide Nirra(?), the thoughtful prince, who cares for the sanctuaries of Zamama and Ištar, the obedient, the humble, who is obedient to Marduk, the great lord, Bel, who [enlarges] his kingdom, and Nabu, the exalted messenger, who prolongs the time of his life, and carried out . . . . , the tireless šakkanak, renewer of Esagila and Ezida, the prince(?) of restorations, who brings great presents to Esagila, the exalted, who understands the effusions (*ituti*) of the upright mind of the great gods, the brave hero, who . . . . , the shepherd(?) of Babylon, who enriches the temples, and establishes the offerings, the princely son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 47.

65. "Evil-Merodach, king of Babylon." In the subscription of each of the twenty-four tablets published by B. T. A. Evetts, M.A. Also in tablets 21 and 23 an additional time.

66. (1) "Neriglassar, king of Babylon." In all of the subscriptions of the seventy-two tablets published by Evetts. Also, in tablets from Neriglassar's reign, 13<sup>3</sup>, <sup>6</sup>, 43<sup>7</sup>, 47<sup>3</sup>, 52<sup>2</sup>, <sup>4</sup>, <sup>9</sup>, 59<sup>1</sup>; and from tablets of Labaši-Marduk, I. 4. 11, 30, 38, and on brick published I R. 8, No. 5.

(2) "Neriglassar" alone. See Evetts' tablets of Evil-Merodach, Nos. 9<sup>7</sup>, 14<sup>11</sup>, 16<sup>14</sup>, <sup>16</sup>, <sup>17</sup>, 19<sup>9</sup>, 22<sup>14</sup>, <sup>16</sup>.

(3) "Neriglassar, son of Belšumiškun." Tablets of Evil-Mero-dach 9<sup>6</sup>, 14<sup>7</sup>, 16<sup>10</sup>, 19<sup>6</sup>, 22<sup>5</sup>.

(4) "N., king of Babylon, restorer of Bitusagil and Bituzidda, who carries out the good things which the great gods have planned for the executing of his kingship, whose lot Merodach, the leader of the gods, the determiner of lots has appointed to perfect the conquest of the lands, whose hand Nebo the true son has entrusted with an upright scepter, etc., and has granted him his weapons to protect the people and bless the land, the son of Belšumiškun, the king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 73.

(5) "N., the king of Babylon, the exalted prince, favorite of Marduk, the obedient, the submissive, worshiper of the lord of lords, the wise, the understanding, who takes care of the places of Nabu, his lord, the priest (prince), the renewer, who spends many gifts on Bitsagil and Bit-zidda, who receives the temple dues, who orders their rites(?), the son of Belšumiškun, the exalted, the wise, the perfect lord, who guards the watch towers of Bit-sagil and Babylon, who like a mighty wall before the land am as a bar." *K. B.*, III. ii. 77.

(6) "N., the king, renewer (builder) who cares for thy places, forever." *K. B.*, III. ii. 79.

64. "Labaši-Marduk, king of Babylon." So in all the subscriptions of the six tablets published by Evetts. In number 1, it is found also in lines 8, 13, 17, 21(?), 28, 33, 36, 40. See, also, *Z. A.*, II., Tafel, No. 11.

68. (1) "Nabunā'id" alone. In Strassmaier's tablets, Nos. 284 l. 13, 419 end, 1036 and 1125; Cyrus cylinder, 17, 33; Nab.-Cyrus Chronicle, Rev. 15, 16, 21.

(2) "N., king of Babylon." In Strassmaier's *Inschriften*, out of 1134 tablets, this title is found in the subscription (or elsewhere) of all that are legible, except four. See, also, *Z. A.*, II. 43, 44. Also, in the great inscription from Ur, Col. I. l. 24, Col. II. 23(?), 31-32, Col. III. 57(?); and in the small inscription from Ur, Col. II. 19; and on the cylinder V R. 64. *Z. K. F.*, II. 245, 249. See also *K. B.*, III. ii. 81, 83(?), 85, 89, 97, 99, 103; *Z. A.*, I. 52.

(3) "N., king of lands." Only in the subscription of tablet 1091.

(4) "N., king of Babylon, the renewer of Esagil and Ezida." I R. 69, Col. I. 63, 64, and Col. II. 45, 46, and I R. 68, No. 7.

(5) "N., the king, his (or thy) renewer." *K. B.*, III. ii. 91, 119.

(6) "The king." Nab.-Cyr. Chron., Ob. Col. I, 2, 7, Col. II. 5, 10, 13, 15, 19 *bis*, 23, Rev. 6, 23.

(7) "The king, his lord." Obv. Col. I. 13.

- (8) "N., the king." Nab.-Cyr. Chr., Obv. Col. II. 10.
- (9) "N., the mighty king, the king of Babylon." *K. B.*, III. ii. 97.
- (10) "N., king of Babylon, restorer of Esagila and Ezida." *K. B.*, III. ii. 97, 119.
- (11) "N., king of Babylon, restorer of Esagila and Ezida, worshiper of the great gods." *K. B.*, III. ii. 95.
- (12) "N., the king of Babylon, the restorer of Esagila and Ezida, the maker of good things, the son of Nabubalaṣsuikbi, the perfect prince." *K. B.*, III. ii. 121.
- (13) "N., king of Babylon, restorer of Esagila and Ezida, the exalted prince, frequenter of the temples of the great gods, who assists at the restorations, whose mind is continually directed to the worship of the gods, the pious, who gives much thought to river and hill, the obedient, the humble, who performs worship by making offerings to gods and goddesses, who, in order not to commit sin, undertook the furnishing(?) of the gods, while he was careful of his life, etc., etc., the son of Nabubalaṣsuikbi, the wise prince." *K. B.*, III. ii. 113, 115.
- (14) "N., the king of Babylon, restorer of Esagila and Ezida, the son of Nabubalaṣsuikbi, the wise prince." *K. B.*, III. ii. 119.
- (15) "N., the king of Babylon, the elect of Nabu and Marduk, the son of Nabubalaṣsuikbi, the wise prince." *K. B.*, III. ii. 119.
- (16) "N., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Babylon, the king of the four quarters of the earth, restorer of Esagila and Ezida, whose fate Sîn and Ningal appointed to be a royal fate [while he was] in the womb of his mother, the son of Nabubalaṣsuikbi, the wise prince, worshiper" [of the great gods].

## II.—TITLES OF THE KINGS OF ASSYRIA FROM THE TIME OF KARAINDAŠ, KING OF BABYLON, DOWNWARD.

1. "Ašurbelnišišu, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 195.
2. "Bušurašur, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 195.
3. (1) "Ašuruballit, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 195, 3.
- (2) "Ašuruballit" (alone). *K. B.*, I. 195.
- (3) "Ašuruballit, the mighty king." *K. B.*, I. 7.
4. "Belnirari, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 197 bis.
5. (1) "Puduilu, king of Assyria, son of Belnirari, son of Ašuruballit, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 3.
- (2) "Puduilu, the rightful prince, the mighty king, the king of Assyria, builder of the house of Šamaš." *K. B.*, I. 5.
6. "Ramman-Nirari, the illustrious prince, the chosen(?) of

god, the hero, šakkanak of the gods, establisher of the fallen cities, of the people of the Kassites, Kutites, Lulumites, and Šubarites, who overwhelms all the enemies, high and low, trampling their lands from Kupdi and Raphik to . . . . , who took possession of the hosts of men, far-stretching boundaries and frontiers, to whom Anu, Ašur, Šamaš, Ramman and Ištar, have subdued the totality of kinglets and princes, the illustrious priest of Bel, son of Pudil, the viceroy of Bel, the priest of Ašur, the conqueror of Tūruki and Nigimti in their whole extent, the destroyer of kinglets, mountains and forests on the border of the wide-spreading Kuti . . . . etc., grandson of Belnirari, priest of Ašur, etc., great-grandson of Ašuruballit, the mighty king," etc. *K. B.*, I. 5, 7.

- (2) "Ramman-Nirari, king of nations." *K. B.*, I. 9.
- (3) "R., king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 197, 129.
- (4) "Ramman-Nirari" alone. *K. B.*, I. 197.
- 7. (1) "Šalmanassar" alone. *K. B.*, I. 9.
- (2) "S., king of nations." *K. B.*, I. 9.
- (3) "S., king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 11 bis, 13.
- (4) "S., king of Assyria, a prince going before me." *K. B.*, I. 69.
- 8. "Tiglat-Adar, king of Assyria, son of Šalmanassar, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 11 bis.
- 9. (1) "Adarapalekur, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 43.
- (2) "A., the mighty (dapini) king, the beloved (nisit) of Ašur." *K. B.*, I. 43.
- 10. "Belkudurušur, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 197.
- 11. (1) "Ašurdan, the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 43, 129, 197.  
(See 15 below.)
  - (2) "A., bearer of an illustrious scepter, ruler of the men of Bel." *K. B.*, I. 41.
- 12. (1) "Mutakkil-Nusku, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 49.
- (2) "M., whom Ašur, the great lord, by the oracle of his upright heart, longed for and called to the government of Assyria in a lawful manner (kiniš)." *K. B.*, I. 41.
- 13. (1) "Ašurrišiši, the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 49, 199.  
 (2) "Ašurrišiši" alone. *K. B.*, I. 199; Bezold's *Catalogue* 1695 [56-9-9, 185].  
 (3) "A., the mighty (danni) king, the conqueror of the lands of the enemies, the subduer of all the proud." *K. B.*, I. 41.
- 14. (1) "Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, II. 119.  
 (2) "Tiglath-Pileser" alone. *K. B.*, I. 69(?).  
 (3) "T., king of nations, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 49.

(4) "T., king of Assyria, the son of Ašurriši, king of Assyria, the son of Mutakkil-Nusku, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 49.

(5) "T., the princee, the beloved, the desire of your heart (*i.e.*, of the great gods), the exalted ruler, whom, in the uprightness of your heart, you have called and decked with a lofty crown and have installed mightily in the kingdom of the land of Bel; to whom you have granted princeliness, exaltation and bravery, as the lot of his lordship, whom ye have called to dominion and power, to the fortress of Eharsagkurkurra forever." *K. B.*, I. 17.

(6) "T., the mighty king, the incomparable king of nations, the king of the four quarters of the earth, king of all kinglets (šar kal malki), lord of lords, utullu(?), king of kings (šar sarrani), the exalted priest, to whom in the name of Šamaš, the glittering scepter was given, and who rules the subjects of Bel altogether, the lawful ruler, whose might is celebrated above (that of) all kinglets, the exalted judge(?), whose weapons Ašur caused to resound, and whose name he called to the government of the four quarters of the world forever, who took distant districts on both sides high and low . . . . , whose glance cast down the four regions," etc. *K. B.* I. 17.

(7) "T., the brave hero, who opens up the paths of the mountains, casts down the disobedient, and sweeps away all the proud." *K. B.*, I. 23.

(8) "T., the mighty king, the scourge(?) of the disobedient, who sweeps away the battle of the hostile." *K. B.*, I. 25.

(9) "T., the mighty king, the conqueror of the quarters of the enemies, the combatant with the totality of all things." *K. B.*, I. 29.

(10) "T., the flaming lightning, the mighty flood-storm of battle." *K. B.*, I. 33.

(11) "T., who treads upon the proud, casts down the disobedient, humbles(?) the mighty altogether." *K. B.*, I. 35.

(12) "T., the brave hero, who holds an incomparable scepter, (and) exercises dominion over the field." *K. B.*, I. 37.

(13) "T., the exalted prince, whom Ašur and Adar bring to the desire of his heart, who marched behind the enemies of Ašur altogether and struck down the mighty altogether." *K. B.*, I. 41.

(14) "T., the princely ancestor, who went before me." *K. B.*, I. 165.

15. (1) "Ašurdan, king of nations, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 49.

(2) Perhaps also *K. B.*, I. 129, where we find "Ašurdanan, king of Assyria." See 11 above.

16. (1) "Ramman-Nirari, king of Assyria." *K. B.* I. 51, 129, 201 *ter*.  
 (2) "R.-N., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria." Bezold's *Catalogue* 1691 [56-9-9-136].  
 (3) "R., king of nations, king of Assyria, son of Ašurdan, king of nations, king of Assyria, son of Tiglath-Pileser, king of nations, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 49.
17. (1) "Tuklat-Adar, king of Assyria, son of Ramman-Nirari, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 51.  
 (2) "T.-A., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria." Bezold's *Catalogue*, 1691 [56-9-9, 136].  
 (3) "T., . . . . , the great king, the mighty king, . . . . , king of nations, king of Assyria, . . . . etc." *K. B.*, I. 51, Be.  
 (4) "T., the king." *K. B.*, I. 204.  
 (5) "Tukulti-Ninip"/\* alone. *K. B.*, I. 153.  
 (6) "Tukulti-Ninip, the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 69, 129.
18. (1) "Ašurnaširabal" alone. *K. B.*, I. 177. Bezold's *Catalogue*, [56-9-9, 165, 28, 134, 201, 136, 142, 144, 152, 156, 159, 154, 155, 165] and [81-2-4, 188].  
 (2) "The king" alone. *K. B.*, I. 41, 63.  
 (3) "Ašurnaširabal, the king." *K. B.*, I. 99, 204.  
 (4) "A., the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 85.  
 (5) "A., the prince going before me." *K. B.* II., 39.  
 (6) "A., the hero" (kardu). *K. B.*, I. 77.  
 (7) "A., the mighty king, king of nations, the incomparable king, the king of the totality of the four regions of the world, the sun of the nations of men, the elect of Bel and Ninib, beloved of Anu and Dagan, the worshiper (kašuš) of the great gods, the humble, the beloved of thy heart, the prince, the favorite of Bel, whose priesthood seemed good to thine exalted godhead, whose government thou hast firmly founded, the illustrious hero, who goes about in the service of Ašur, his lord. Among the kings of the four regions of the world there is none like him, the shepherd of the tabraati(?), who fears not opposition, the mighty flood who has no opponent, the king who subdues the disobedient, who compels the totality of the nations of men, the manly, the strong, who tramples on the neck of his enemies, treads on the totality of the strangers, breaks in pieces the bonds of the mighty, who in the service of the great gods, his lords, goes about and with his hand conquers all the lands, compels the forests in their whole extent, and takes their increase, who seizes whips and exercises power(?) over all lands." *K. B.*, I. 55.

\* Tukulti-Ninip is thought to have been the same as Tuklat-Adar.

8. "A., the exalted prince, the worshiper of the great gods, . . . . who conquers cities and forests in their whole extent, king of lords, who burns the wicked, who is clothed with terror, fears not opposition, the exalted and unconquerable prince who casts down iniquity, the king of all kinglets, the lord of lords, . . . . king of kings, exalted priest, the elect of the hero Ninib, the worshiper of the great gods, the avenger, the king, who in the service of Ašur and Šamaš, the gods of his trust, goes about uprightly, and mighty mountains and the kings (malki) his enemies, cuts down like abi(?)cane, and the totality of their lands subdues, restorer of the gifts to the great gods, the lawful prince, who is continually engaged in bringing about the right observance of the temple rules, whose handiwork and offerings the great gods of heaven and earth love, and his priesthood in the temples have established forever, . . . . who conquers the enemies of Ašur, the mighty king, the king of Assyria, the son of Tukulti-Ninib, the priest of Ašur, who cast down the totality of his opponents and fixed upon beams the bodies of his enemies, the grandson of Ramman-Nirari, the priest, the šakkanak of the great gods, who accomplished the overthrow of the disobedient . . . . the grandson of Ašurdan the founder of cities and builder of temples." *K. B.*, I. 55.

(9) "I am the king, the lord, the exalted, the lofty, the strong, the active, the prince, the noble, the hero, the mighty, the manly, Ašurnaširabal, the mighty king, the king of Assyria, the called of Sin, the favorite of Anu, the beloved of Ramman, the most powerful of the gods. I am the unconquerable weapon, which overwhelms the land of his enemies. I am the king, strong in battle, who destroys cities and forests, the prince in battle, the king of the four quarters of the world, who overthrows his enemies, brings to destruction all his enemies, the king of the nations of the quarters of the world, of the totality of kinglets,—the king, who suppresses the disobedient, who bends to his will all the nations of mankind." *K. B.*, I. 57, 59.

(10) "A., the exalted prince, the worshiper of the great gods, whom Bel permits to realize the wish of his heart, and whose mighty hand conquers the totality of disobedient kinglets, who conquers his enemies, who in impassable ways breaks the bond (conspiracy) of the mighty." *K. B.*, I. 59.

(11) "A., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the son of Tukulti-Ninip, the great king, the mighty king, king of nations, king of Assyria, the son of Ramman-Nirari, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the

king of Assyria,—the noble hero, who goes about in the service of Ašur, his lord, and has not his equal among the kings of the four quarters of the world,—the king, who has conquered from the ford of the Tigris to the mountains of Lebanon and the great sea,” etc. *K. B.*, I. 95.

(12) “A., the great king, the mighty king, the king of Assyria, the son of Tukulti-Ninip, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, son of Ramman-Nirari, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria,—the manly hero, who in the service of Ašur, his lord, goes about and has not his equal among the kinglets of the four quarters of the world, the shepherd of tabrati(?), who fears no opposition, the mighty flood who has no opponent, the king who casts down the disobedient, who subdues the totality of the nations of mankind,—the manly, the mighty, who treads on the neck of his enemies, tramples on all his foes, breaks the confederacy of the mighty,—who goes about in the service of the great gods, his lords, conquers all lands with his hand, conquers all their forests and takes their increase, lays hold of whips and exercises power over all lands.” *K. B.*, I. 113, 115.

(13) “A., the exalted prince, the worshiper (*paliḥ*) of the great gods, the powerful ?, who conquers cities and forests in their whole extent, the king of lords, who burns up the wicked, the exalted, unconquerable, who brings down iniquity, king of all the kinglets, king of kings (*šar kal malki, šar šarrani*), the exalted priest, the called of the hero Ninib, the worshiper (*kašuš*) of the great gods, who in the service of Ašur and Ninib, his divine helpers, goes about uprightly, and subdues mighty mountains and all the lands of the hostile kinglets, who fights with the enemies of Ašur, high and low, and lays upon them tribute and gifts. A., the mighty king, the called of Sin, the favorite of Anu, the beloved of Ramman, the mightiest of the gods, the unconquerable weapon, who casts down the land of his enemies am I; the king, the mighty in battle who destroys cities and forests, the first in fight, the king of the four quarters of the world, who overwhelms his enemies.” *K. B.*, I. 115, 117.

(14) “A., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the son of Tukulti-Ninib, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, son of Ramman-Nirari, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria.” *K. B.*, I. 123. Compare Bezold’s *Catalogue* 1691 [56-9-9, 136].

(15) "A., viceroy of Bel, the priest of Ašur, whose priesthood seemed good to the gods and to whom they have made subject the totality of lands." *K. B.*, I. 153.

19. (1) "Šalmanašar" alone. *K. B.*, I. 206, 135.
- (2) "S., the king." *K. B.*, I. 204.
- (3) "S., king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 201 *ter*, 137.
- (4) "S., the son of Ašurnaširabal." *K. B.*, III. ii. 101.
- (5) "S., the exalted, the violent." *K. B.*, I. 134.
- (6) "S., the mighty king." *K. B.*, I. 136.
- (7) "S., the viceroy of Bel." *K. B.*, I. 189.
- (8) "S., the mighty king, the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 137.
- (9) "S., king of the four quarters of the world." *K. B.*, I. 177.
- (10) Same as last, plus "my father." *K. B.*, I. 177.

(11) "S., the mighty king, the enlarger of Eharsagkurkura, the mountain of the lands." *K. B.*, II. 189.

- (12) He calls himself "the hero." *K. B.*, I. 169.

(13) "S., the king of the nations of mankind, the prince, the high priest of Ašur, the mighty king, king of all the four quarters of the world, the sun of the nations of mankind, traverser of all lands, son of Ašurnaširabal, the exalted high priest, whose priesthood over the gods they (themselves) prepared, and cast all lands down at his feet, the illustrious progeny of Tukulti-Adar's, who subdued all his foes and swept them away like a flood." *K. B.*, I. 181.

(14) "S., the king of the nations of mankind, the prince, the high priest of Ašur, the mighty king, the king of Assyria, the king of all the four quarters of the world, the sun of the nations of mankind, traverser of all lands, the king, the worshiper (*ba'id*) of the gods, the favorite of Bel, the šakkanak of Ašur, the overseer (*pit-ķudu*), the exalted prince, discerner of ways and ascents, who treads the tops of the mountains and of all forests, receiver of tribute and of the presents of all the four quarters, who opens up paths high and low, before whose powerful battle array the four quarters bow down, when he shatters(?) with his heroic might the foundations of the lands, the manly, the mighty, who in reliance upon Ašur, and Šamaš, the gods, his helpers, goes about, and among the kings of the four quarters of the world has not his equal, king of the lands (*šar matâti*), the mighty (*šarhu*), who treads steep paths, visits mountains and seas, the son of Ašurnaširabal, the viceroy (*šakan*) of Bel, the high priest of Ašur, etc., the illustrious progeny of Tukulti-Ninib (Adar)." *K. B.*, I. 153.

20. (1) "Šamši-Ramman, the king." *K. B.*, I. 206.

(2) "Šamši-Ramman" alone. See Bezold's *Catalogue*, pages 1694<sup>2</sup>, 1695, 1769.

(3) "S.-R., the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 201 *ter*.

(4) "S.-R., the viceroy of Bel, the king of Assyria, the son of Šalmanašar, viceroy of Bel." *K. B.*, I. 189.

(5) "S.-R., the mighty king, king of nations, the incomparable, the keeper of places, bearer of the scepter of righteousness, subduer of lands everywhere, ruler of all, whose name the gods announced aforetime, the illustrious priest, renewer of Ešara . . . who exalts the decrees of the temple, who pays attention to the beauty of Eharsagkurkura (and) the temples of his land, and is obedient(?) ; the son of Šalmanašar, the king of the four regions, restorer of the kings of all, trampler of lands, grandson of Ašurnaširabal, receiver of tribute and gifts of all regions." *K. B.*, I. 177.

21. (1) "Ramman-Nirari, the king." *K. B.*, I. 206.

(2) "R.-N., king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 201 *ter*, 203.

(3) "R.-N., king of Assyria, his lord." *K. B.*, I. 193.

(4) "R.-N., the viceroy of Bel, the king of Assyria, the son of Šamši-Ramman, the viceroy of Bel, the king of Assyria, the son of Šalmanašar, the viceroy of Bel." *K. B.*, I. 189.

(5) "R.-N., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, a king whom in his boyhood, Ašur the king of the Igigi called and endowed with an incomparable kingdom, whose hand hath conquered and overthrown all from the great sea of the east (lit. of the rising of the sun) to the great sea of the west (šulmu šamši), the son of Šamši-Ramman, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the incomparable king, the son of Šalmanašar the king of the four regions, who put all his enemies under the yoke and swept them away like a flood, the grandson of Ašurnaširabal, the mighty knight (ardu kardu) who puts his garrisons in distant regions" [lit. makes wide the habitations of the troops]. *K. B.*, I. 189.

(6) "R.-N., the exalted prince (rubu na'du), to whose assistance Ašur, Šamaš, Ramman, and Marduk have come, and have extended his land; grandson of Tukulti-Ninib, king of Assyria, king of Šumer and Akkad, grandson of Šalmanašar, the mighty king, the enlarger of Eharsagkurkura, the mountain of the lands, grandson of Belkapkap, the earlier king, who ruled the kingdom of Sulili from pristine times, and whose destiny Ašur announced of old." *K. B.*, I. 189, 191.

(7) "R.-N., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king, whom Ašur king of the Igigi called in

his boyhood, and endowed with an incomparable kingdom, making good like a meadow his government over the people of Assyria, and establishing his throne; the illustrious priest, restorer of Ešarra, the tireless," etc. *K. B.*, I. 191.

22. (1) "Šalmanašar, the king." *K. B.*, I. 206.

(2) "S., king of Assyria(?)". *K. B.*, I. 210.

23. (1) "Ašur-danan (or Ašur-dan), the king." *K. B.*, I. 206.

(2) "A., the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 210.

24. (1) "Ašur-Nirari, the king." *K. B.*, I. 205.

(2) "A.-N., the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 212.

25. (1) "Tiglath-Pileser" alone. *K. B.*, I. 205, 212; II. 275, 277 *ter*. See also Bezold's *Catalogue*, pages 1694 and 1691 and 1387.

(2) "T.-P., the king." *K. B.*, I. 205, note.

(3) "T.-P., the king of Assyria." *K. B.*, I. 212.

(4) "T.-P., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of Šumer and Akkad, the king of the four regions [the obedient, the beloved of Bel: so Rost], the king who from the rising (ṣit) of the sun to the going down (erib) of the sun . . . subdues the men of the lands high and low, exiles their kings and sets up his viceroys." *K. B.*, II. 3, 5.

(5) "T.-P., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of Babylon, the king of Šumer and Akkad, the king of the four regions, the mighty,\* the brave, who in reliance upon Ašur, his lord, shattered like a potter's vessel all who disobeyed him, swept them away like a flood," etc. *K. B.*, II. 9, 11.

(6) "T.-P., the great king, the mighty king, king of nations, king of Assyria, king of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, king of the four regions, the obedient, beloved of Bel." Plate Inscription of Nimrud, No. 2. See *Die Keilinschriftexte Tiglat-Pilesers*, III, von Paul Rost, page 51.

26. (1) "Šalmanašar" alone. *K. B.*, I. 205, 214; II. 277 *ter*. See, also, Bezold's *Catalogue*, pages 1387, 1689, 1692 and 1805.

(2) "The king" (šarru) alone. *K. B.*, II. 33.

(3) "S., king of Assyria." *K. B.*, II. 33; I. 214.

27. (1) "Sargon" alone. *K. B.*, I. 205, II. 275, 277 four times, 279 *bis*; *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, II. 214; I Raw. 6, No. 7; Winckler, *Die Keilinschriftexte Sargon's*, 77, 191, 196?. See, also, 82-5-22, 144, Bezold, page 1839; 81-2-4, 182, *id.*, 1769; 82-5-22, 90, *id.*, 1835; 56-9-9, 171, *id.*, 1694; K. 11079, *id.*, 1136; K. 4730,

\* Schrader reads *dannu*; Rost *id-lu*.

*id.*, 657; K. 5550, *id.*, 728; K. 13173, *id.*, 1293; Rm. 618, *id.*, 1627; Rm. 215, *id.*, 1594.

- (2) "The king" (*šarru*) alone. *K. B.*, II. 51, 279; "malku" alone. *K. B.*, II. 81; Winckler, *Die Keilinschrifftexte Sargon's*, 77.
- (3) "Sargon, their king." K. 588.
- (4) "Sargon, my lord." Rm. 215 Obv. 2 and 3.
- (5) "The king, my lord." Rm. 215 Obv. 4, Rev. 6.
- (6) "Sargon, the king, my lord." K. 114 Obv. 2.
- (7) "Sargon, the mighty king." Rm. 618, Bezold, 1627.
- (8) "Sargon, the king of Assyria." III R., Pl. 2, Nos. 1, 4, 5; *K. B.*, II. 277; Winckler, 192 *bis*, 196; 83-1-18, 425, Bezold, 1889; K. 4678, Bezold, 653.
- (9) "Sargon, the king of Babylon." Rm. 2, 345, Bezold, 1669.
- (10) "Sargon, the king of Babylon, king of the lands, the mighty king, my lord." K. 4687 *bis*, Bezold, 653.
- (11) "Sargon, king of the lands." K. 7426 Obv. 2.
- (12) "King of the lands" alone. K. 7426 Obv. 4(?).
- (13) "Sargon, the king of nations." Winckler, 193; K. 588 Obv. 1.
- (14) "Sargon, the king of nations, my lord." K. 114.
- (15) "Sargon, the king of nations, king of Assyria, *šakkanak* of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad." Winckler, 190, 194, 143, 139, 137.
- (16) "Sargon, the king of nations, king of Assyria, king of Šumer and Akkad." III R., Pl. 2, No. 23.
- (17) The same as (11), except that it adds "the builder of the holy place." Winckler, 191, 192.
- (18) "The active king, the proclaimer of excellent speech." *K. B.*, II. 45.
- (19) "The clear-minded, sharp-eyed king." *K. B.*, II. 45.
- (20) "S., the pious king." Winckler, 41.
- (21) "S., viceroy (*šaknu*) of Bel, high priest of Ašur, the mighty king, the king of Assyria." Winckler, 193.
- (22) "S., the rightful prince, the reverer (*paliḥ*) of the oath of Nabu and Marduk, and protector of the name of Ašur." Winckler, 189.
- (23) "S., king of nations, king of Assyria." Winckler, 194 *bis*.
- (24) "S., viceroy of Bel, high priest of Ašur, *šakkanak* of Nabu and Marduk." Winckler, 195.
- (25) "S., king of Assyria, lord of the provinces(?) (or viceroys(?) *amelu bel pihāti*).)" Winckler, 196.
- (26) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations,

king of Assyria, šakkanak of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, the favorite of the great gods." Winckler, 97, 147, 159.

(27) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the šakkanak of Babylon, the king of Šumer and Akkad, the king of the four regions, the favorite of the great gods," etc. Winckler, 81, at the beginning of the Annal-Inscription of Hall XIV. The superscription of the Stele Inscription is the same, with the addition at the end of the phrase, "a [likut mahria]," "who walk before me." Winckler, 175.

(28) "S., viceroy of Bel, high priest of Ašur, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, king of the four regions, the favorite of the great gods," etc. Winckler, 165.

(29) "S., viceroy of Bel, high priest of Ašur, the chosen (*nišit enâ*) of Anu and Bel, the great king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions, the favorite of the great gods, the rightful shepherd, whose fame Ašur and Marduk have caused to go out to the ends of the earth, the mighty hero, enwrapped in terror, who grasps his weapons to overthrow his foes, the brave champion (*idlu ḫardu*) who from the beginning of his lordship has found no rival king (*malku*), nor victorious competitor," etc. Winckler, 169.

(30) "S., the viceroy of Bel, the exalted high priest of Ašur, the chosen of Anu and Dagan, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions, the favorite of the great gods, the rightful shepherd, whom Ašur, Nabu and Marduk have granted an incomparable kingdom, whose fame they have caused to go out to the ends of the earth, etc., etc., the mightiest (*li'*) of all kings (*malki*), etc., the mighty hero, enwrapped in terror, who grasped his weapons to overwhelm his foes, a king, who from the beginning of his lordship has found no rival king, nor in strife and battle met with a conqueror, who has dashed all lands in pieces like a potter's vessel, and bridled the four regions of the world." K. B., II. 39-41.

(31) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, šakkanak of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, favorite of the great gods, the rightful shepherd, whom the gods Ašur and Marduk have granted an incomparable kingdom." See superscription to the Bull Inscription. Text by Winckler, Plate 41.

(32) "S., the viceroy of Bel, the high priest of Ašur, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, king of the four regions, favorite of the great gods, the rightful shepherd,

whom the gods Ašur and Marduk have granted an incomparable kingdom." etc. Bronze Inscription. Plate by Winckler, No. 42.

(33) "S., the viceroy of Bel, the prince of Ašur, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king who ruled over the four regions from the outgoing to the downgoing of the sun and placed over them his viceroys." Silver Inscription: Lyon's *Keilinschriftexte Sargon's*, page 23; gold inscription the same, Lyon, page 25; antimony or mineral inscription the same, except *patesi Ašur* instead of *nisakku Ašur*, line 2, Lyon, page 27.

28. (1) "Sennacherib" alone. *K. B.*, I. 207, 215; II. 279 four times, 281 *bis*. See, also, Smith's *History of Sennacherib*, pages 14, 17, 18 *bis*, and K. 961, K. 125, K. 7434, Rm. 2, 14, and Bu. 81-7-27, 41. See, also, Bezold, 763(?), 768, 1514, 1692, 1835, 1873, and 1944, and K. 122.

(2) "The king alone." So in K. 448 in the letter from Pahirbel (or Upahhirbel) to the king. See Smith's *History*, p. 10, and in the phrase "kirri šarri," "the walks of the king," Smith, 162, 163 *ter*.

(3) "S., the king." *K. B.*, I. 206, note; II. 281.

(4) "The king of Assyria." K. 5464<sup>12</sup>,<sup>17</sup>.

(5) "S., the king of Assyria." I R., 7, C., G., J., and Smith's *History of Sennacherib*, pages 10, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 69, 142 and 164. See, also, Bezold, 507, 714(?), 1540, 1589, 1830, 1882, 1885.

(6) "S., king of nations, king of Assyria." I R., 7, H. I.; I R., 6, B; III R., 4, No. 4; 16, No. 3. See, also, Smith's *History*, pp. 41, 69, 160, 164, 165; and Budge's *History of Esarhaddon*, page 15.

(7) "S., the great king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria." I R., 6, VIII. A.

(8) "The king, my lord, Sennacherib." K. 5464 Obv. 1, 2.

(9) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria." I R., 7, VIII. D.; III R., 16, No. 5, and in Smith's *History*, page 165.

(10) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions." I R., 7, F.

(11) "The king, my lord, Sennacherib." K. 5464<sup>1</sup>,<sup>2</sup>.

(12) "S., king of Assyria, the father, my begetter" (abu banua). *K. B.*, II. 131.

(13) "S., my grandfather, my begetter" (ab abi alidiya). *K. B.*, II. 155.

(14) "S., the king of Assyria, my grandfather, my begetter" (ab abi baniya). *K. B.*, II. 233.

(15) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of Assyria,

the incomparable king, the powerful shepherd, the worshiper of the great gods, keeper of treaties, lover of righteousness, maker of peace, the famous marcher in war(?), protector of good, the powerful hero, the warlike man, head over kings (asariddan malki), the giant consuming the disobedient, the breaker of bonds." Smith's *History*, pages 1 and 2.

(16) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions, reverer (megir) of the great gods." Smith's *History*, page 3.

(17) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions, the reverer of the great gods, the appointed judge, the warlike man, head over kings, the giant consuming the disobedient, the breaker of bonds." Smith's *History*, pages 3 and 4.

(18) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions, the appointed shepherd, the reverer of the great gods, keeper of treaties, lover of righteousness, maker of peace, the famous marcher in war(?), protector of good, the powerful hero, the warlike man, head over kings, the giant consuming the disobedient, the breaker of bonds." Smith's *History*, page 5.

(19) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions, the reverer of the great gods, the warrior, the judge, the appointed king (malku pit-qudu), the shepherd of the people, renowned among widely distant nations." Smith's *History*, page 7.

(20) "S., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions, reverer of the great gods, upon whom the great gods Ašur and Ištar have conferred an incomparable kingdom." Smith's *History*, page 161.

29. (1) "Esarhaddon" alone. *K. B.*, II. 123, 283 bis, 285 bis and K. 961. See also Bezold's *Catalogue*, pages 438 K. 2388, 481 K. 2852, 564 K. 3788, 633 K. 4444, 637 K. 4504, 638 K. 4519, 774 K. 6259, 783 K. 6386, 880 K. 7862, 1164 K. 11438, 1165 K. 11445, 1168<sup>3</sup> K. 11476, K. 11481 and K. 11478, 1169<sup>5</sup> K. 11483, K. 11485, K. 11487, K. 11488, K. 11489, 1171<sup>2</sup> K. 11500, K. 11504, 1226 K. 12201, 1266 K. 12783, 1328 K. 13648, 1342 K. 13826, 1415 Sm. 524, 1423 Sm. 657, 1424 Sm. 663, 1461 Sm. 1079, 1467 Sm. 1158, 1478 Sm. 1320, 1492 Sm. 1516, 1523 Sm. 2005, 1539 Sm. 2485(?), 1732 (80-7-19, 43), 1735<sup>3</sup> (80-7-19, 71, 73, 75), 1742 (80-7-19, 137), 1768 (81-2-4, 173), 1769 (81-2-4, 190), 1835 (82-5-22, 90), 1836 (82-5-22, 105), 1839 (82-5-22, 136), 1842 (82-5-22, 175), 1843

(82-5-22, 480), 1844<sup>2</sup> (82-5-22, 485 and 488), 1845 (82-5-22, 494), 1847 (82-5-22, 527), 1854 (83-1-18, 1), 1858 (83-1-18, 45), 1894 (83-1-18, 477), 1898<sup>3</sup> (83-1-18, 530, 531, [568], 536), 1899<sup>5</sup> (83-1-18, 540, 543, 544, 546, 548), 1900 (83-1-18, 559), 1901 (83-1-18, 571), 1902<sup>3</sup> (83-1-18, 577, 580, 582), 1908 (83-1-18, 765), 1912 (83-1-18, 836), 1915 (83-1-18, 897), 1916 (83-1-18, 898), 1917 (Bu. 89-4-26, 5), 1928 (Bu. 89-4-26, 151), 1944 (Bu. 91-5-9, 167, 169), 1945 (Bu. 91-5-9, 181), 1946 (Bu. 91-5-9, 194), 1947 (Bu. 91-5-9, 199).

- (2) "The king" alone. *K. B.*, II. 285 *bis*; Budge, *History*, 85.
- (3) "Esarhaddon, the king." Bezold's *Catalogue*, page 463, K. 2663.
- (4) "The king of Assyria." *K. B.*, II. 285.
- (5) "Esarhaddon, king of Assyria." *K. B.*, III. ii. 85, 101 (in Nabonâ'id's inscriptions), and Bezold's *Catalogue*, pages 440 and 1406.
- (6) "E., king of Babylon." Bezold's *Catalogue*, page 1543.
- (7) "E., king of nations, king of Assyria." I R., 8, No. 3; 48, No. 8.
- (8) "E., king of Assyria, king of Babylon(?)?" I R., 48, No. 5 (doubtful).
- (9) "E., king of Assyria, son of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, son of Sargon, king of Assyria." I R., 48, No. 3.
- (10) "E., the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the son of Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, the son of Sargon, king of Assyria." I R., 48, No. 2.
- (11) "E., king of nations, king of Assyria, king of Šumer and Akkad, king of Karduniyaš." I R., 48, No. 7.
- (12) "E., king of nations, king of Assyria, of Hatti-land(?), Egypt and Kush." Budge's revision of I R., 48, No. 4, given in his *History of Esarhaddon*, page 16. Lehmann discusses the signs at length in his "Šamaššumukin," page 79, q.v.
- (13) "E., the great king, the mighty king, king of nations, king of Assyria, šakkanak of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, king of the kings of Egypt, Patrus (Budge reads Hatti), and Kush." I R., 48, No. 9.
- (14) "E., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the šakkanak of Babylon, the king of Šumer and Akkad." Lehmann's Šamaššumukin, Tafel XXVIII. 4, 5; I. R., 48, No. 6.
- (15) "E., king of nations, king of Assyria, šakkanak of Bel, king of Šumer and Akkad, the exalted prince, the worshiper of Nabu and Marduk." *K. B.*, II. 121, I R., 49.

(16) "E., king of Assyria, the father, my begetter." *K. B.*, II. 153, 155, 159. See Budge's *History*, pages 109, 111.

(17) "The father, my begetter." So called by Ašurbanipal, see *K. B.*, II. 159, 163, 167, 177, 233. Budge, *History*, 125.

(18) The Prisms A and C as restored by Abel and others read: "E., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, šakkanak of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, son of Sennacherib, the great king, the mighty king, king of Assyria, son of Sargon, the great king, the mighty king, king of Assyria, who in reliance upon Ašur, Sin, Šamaš, Nabu, Marduk, Ištar of Nineveh, (and) Ištar of Arbela, the great gods, his lords, goes about from the rising to the setting of the sun, without a rival." *K. B.*, II. 124.

(19) "E., my son, whose name after this, (shall be )Ašurebil-mukurpal." Budge's *History*, page 15.

(20) "E., the king's son." Bezold's *Catalogue*, page 1836.

30. (1) "Ašurbanipal" alone. I R., 48, Nos. 5, 6, 7; *K. B.* II. 115, 155, 211, 285; S. A. Smith's *Keilinschriftexte Asurbanipal's*, I. 53; III. 11, 13; Bezold's *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum*, pages 60, 185, 186, 259, 289, 290, 297, 299, 313, 378, 474, 478, 495, 633, 652, 657, 663, 718(?), 968, 970, 1079, 1165 bis, 1166, 1167, 1172 bis, 1201, 1227, 1328, 1339, 1393, 1462, 1464, 1482, 1520, 1561, 1634, 1649, 1688, 1689, 1707, 1730, 1742, bis 1754, 1768, 1801, 1820, 1821, 1822, 1838, 1842, 1843, 1858, 1870, 1873, 1881, 1884, 1894, 1895, 1909, 1925, 1930, 1947.

(2) "The king" alone. III R., 45, No. 1; Smith's *Asurbanipal*, II. 2, 23, 32, 37, 41<sup>1</sup>, 44, 46<sup>3</sup>, 47, 49, 63, III. 7, 18<sup>2</sup>, 22, 31<sup>2</sup>, 37(?), 39<sup>2</sup>, 40<sup>2</sup>, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 71, 75<sup>4</sup>, 78, 82.\*

(3) "Ašurbanipal, the king." See the *Annals*, Col. V, lines 100, 101, and Bezold's *Catalogue*, 615, K. 4300.

(4) "King Ašurbanipal." Bezold, page 201. Doubtful. See Harper, page 485, *i.e.*, K. 961.

\* *Assyrian Letters*, I. 8, 15, II. 9, III. 7<sup>6</sup>, 9, 11, 20, 23, IV. 3<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>4</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>; R. F. Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, pages 4, 14, 18, 147, 184, 185, 365, 466, 473, 538, 671, 52, 220, 288, 294, 295, 296, 298, 299, 301<sup>2</sup>, 302, 303<sup>2</sup>, 304<sup>3</sup>, 305, 307, 308, 309<sup>2</sup>, 310, 311, 312, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 440, 508, 517, 556, 557, 566, 570, 601, 615<sup>2</sup>, 697, 750, 753<sup>2</sup>, 774, 791; Bezold's *Catalogue*, pages 124, 135, 141, 175, 176<sup>2</sup>, 195, 217, 221, 222, 236, 247(?), 255, 1856, 1857, 1861, 1929(?), 1947, 1439, 1561, 1578, 1836, 1863, 1928, 1942, 928, 144, 193, 199?, 234, 243, 263, 278, 314, 113, 114, 115, 175, 274, 194, 319. In Smith's Assyrian letters and in Harper's and Bezold's works referred to above, it is impossible always to say what particular king is meant. As the tablets in which the word occurs have all been found in Assurbanipal's library, we have thought it best to put the lists here.

(5) "The king of Assyria." From what is published in Bezold and Harper, it is certain that this phrase is used at times of Ašurbanipal. It occurs on the tablets of Ašurbanipal's general Belibni, published in Harper, pages 283, 284 (K. 10 Rev. 4 and K. 13 Obv. 28), and on page 852 ( $\pm$ 83-1-18, 52 Obv. 10); and in Bezold's Catalogue, probably also of Ašurbanipal, 193, 363, 366, 925, 1520 bis, 1933; and, accompanied by the phrase "the king of nations," in Bezold, page 1859.

(6) "Ašurbanipal, the king of Assyria." See III R., Pl. 2, No. 24, Pl. 37, No. 1, and Tablet I, III Obv. and Rev. *bis*, and IV; and K. B., II. 175, 185, 187, 189; and Harper, page 312; and S. A. Smith's *Asurbanipal*, I. 19, 27, 29, 31, II. 51, III. 4, 5, 6<sup>2</sup>, 7, 12, 13, III. 79, 81, 128; and Bezold's Catalogue, 7, 26, 103, 109, 287, 305, 509, 565, 856, 1481, 1575, 1739, 1882, 1892.

(7) "Ašurbanipal, the king of Elam." Smith's *Asurbanipal*, III. 1 l. 12 (K. 2674, l. 12).

(8) "A., the king, the king of Assyria." Bezold, 1876 (83-1-18, 265).

(9) "A., the son of Esarhaddon." Bezold, 1164 (K. 11438).

(10) "A., the son of the king." Bezold, 1164, 1165 (K. 11440 and K. 11445).

(11) "A., the king of Assyria, the son of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria." Bezold, 1756 (Bu. 81-2-4, 48).

(12) "A., the king of nations (*šar kiššati*), the king of Assyria." Bezold, 5 (K. 24) and 27 (K. 105)(?); I R., 48, No. 8, *id.*, 7, No. 1x, A, B, C, D and E, 8, Nos. 1 and 3, II R., 38, No. 3, III R., 37 and III R., 48, Rm. 20.

(13) "A., my lord." Harper, 485 (K. 961 Obv. 9, 10).

(14) "A., the king of Assyria, thy (Ašur's?) reverer." K. 159 Rev. 25, 26. Smith's *Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipal's*, III. 80.

(15) "A., the king of Assyria, the creature of thy hands." K. 159 Rev. 22, 23, *id.*

(16) "A., the creature of thy hands." K. 159 Rev. 32, 33, *id.*

(17) "A., the merciful," etc. (*libbu rapšu*). Smith, I. 33; K. B., II. 190.

(18) "A., the prince, his reverer." Smith, I. 35; K. B., II. 192.

(19) "The king, whom God knew, art thou." See *Annals of Asurbanipal*, Smith, I. 21.

(20) "A., the king of Assyria, the king of Babylon." I R., 48, No. 9.

(21) "A., king of nations, king of Assyria, king of Šumer and Akkad, king of Karduniaš." I R. 48, No. 7.

(22) "My brother." So Šamaššumukin addresses Ašurbanipal in a letter. Bu. 80-19, 17, Smith's *Letters*, IV, 8.

(23) "The king, my brother." Occurs in same letter, *i.e.*, Bu. 80-19, 17.

(24) "A., king of Assyria, the prince, her (*i.e.*, Beltis') reverer, the šakkanak, the creature of her hands." Smith, II. 10 (No. 64).

(25) "A., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria." Smith, III. 6 (K. 2674) and [Bu. 81-7-27, 177] Bezdol 1808.

(26) "A., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions, the king of kings (šar šarrani), the incomparable prince, the son of Esarhaddon, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the šakkanak of Babylon, king of Šumer and Akkad, grandson of Sennacharib, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria." III R., 16, No. 5; K. B., II. 259.

(27) "A., the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria, the king of the four regions." Smith, I. 78; K. B., III. 232.

(28) "A., the king, the illustrious prince, the prayerful chief (rešu mutninnu); the creature of the hands of Ašur." K. B., II, 214; Smith, I. 58.

(29) "A., the creature of Ašur and Beltis, the great son of the king of the house of instruction," etc. (Bitriduti). Smith, I. 2; K. B., II. 152.

(30) "A., the king, the beloved (naram) of the heart of Bel." Smith, I. 70.

(31) "The lord of kings." So in Belibni's letters, K. 13 Obv. 3 and K. 5398 Obv. 3, 4. The phrase occurs, also, in Bu. 91-5-9, 113 Obv. 7, Rev. 11, 13, 16(?); and in K. 5398 Obv. 3 and 4. (The tablet is broken and "my lord" should probably be supplied.)

(32) "The lord of kings, my lord."\* So in Belibni's letters, K. 10 Obv. 1; K. 13 Obv. 16, 17, 32, Rev. 8, 10, 28, 31; K. 524 Obv. 1, 5; K. 599 Obv. 1, 5; K. 1926 Obv. 3; 83-1-18, 4 Obv. 1, 3; 83-1-18, 51 Obv. 1, 3; 83-1-18, 52 Obv. 1, 4, Rev. 3, 12; 83-1-18, 150 Obv. 1, 3, 5; Bu. 95-5-9, 107 Obv. 8.

(33) "The lord of kings, the king of the lands, my lord." Belibni's letter, K. 10 Obv. 4.

(34) "The king, the king, my lord"(?). 83-1-18, 21 Rev. 10.

\* This phrase is found, also, in K. 1122 Obv. 3; K. 1260 Obv. 12, 16; K. 1374 Obv. 1, 3(?), 4(?), 5(?), 8, Rev. 15, 18 bis, 20, 21, 25; K. 520 Obv. 1, 3; K. 1964 Obv. 1(?), 3, Rev. 5, 8; S. 1592 Obv. 1.

(35) "The king of the lands." Letter to "the king of the lands, my lord." Bu. 91-5-9, 73 Obv. 3.

(36) "The king, the mighty šakkanak(?), my lord." K. 1249 Obv. 3. (See S. A. Smith, *K. A.*, III. 50.)

(37) "To the king of multitudes(?) my lord." K. 4791, 3. See note in S. A. Smith's *Assyrian Letters*, III. 9. K. 1158 mentions Belibni, Ašurbanipal's general, and thus shows that K. 479, which was written by the same man, Ugar-Bel-lu-mur, is addressed to Ašurbanipal. See, also, K. 476, which S. A. Smith gives in his *Keilschrifttexte*, II. 41.

(38) "The king of the lands, my lord." So in Kudurru's letters, K. 81 Obv. 1, 3; K. 82 Obv. 1; K. 154 Obv. 1; K. 1066 Obv. 1, 3; K. 1899 Obv. 1(?); K. 6946 Obv. 1. (Kudurru's letters K. 1066 and K. 1899 both mention Belibni, Ašurbanipal's general.)\*

(39) "The king of kings, my lord." K. 615 Obv. 1; and 83-1-18, 260 Obv. 1.

(40) "The king, my lord." Belibni's letters, K. 10 Obv. 6, Rev. 11; K. 524 Obv. 15, Rev. 24; K. 13 Rev. 5, K. 1926 Obv. 1, 5, Rev. 5, 7; K. 597 Obv. 3, 6, 7, 13, 16, 20, 21; 5398 Obv. 5, Rev. 2, 3; K. 599 Obv. 9, 13, Rev. 2. So in Nabubelšume's letters, K. 982<sup>3</sup>, K. 1074<sup>3</sup>, K. 5418<sup>b2</sup>, K. 5423<sup>a1</sup>, K. 7526<sup>2</sup>, K. 12954<sup>3</sup>, Bu. 83-1-18, 21<sup>6</sup>. So, also, in the letters of Tabu-ešarra, K. 466<sup>5</sup>, K. 507<sup>3</sup>, K. 515<sup>3</sup>, K. 594<sup>4</sup>, K. 620<sup>5</sup>, K. 656<sup>5</sup>, K. 1057<sup>3</sup>, K. 1147<sup>4</sup>.†

\* The phrase "king of the lands, my lord" is found, also, K. 467 Obv. 1 and 2; K. 647 Obv. 1, 4, 6 (*our lord*); K. 1107 Obv. 1, 4; K. 5585 Obv. 1, 4; K. 7467 Obv. 1, 6 (*our lord*); K. 509 Obv. 1, 5; K. 562 Obv. 1, 6; K. 607 Obv. 1, 6; K. 79 Obv. 1, 3; K. 462 Obv. 1, 3; K. 514 Obv. 1, 4; K. 528 Obv. 1, 4; K. 1089 Obv. 1, 3; K. 4736 Obv. 1, 3; K. 1249 Obv. 1; K. 638 Obv. 1, 3; K. 22 Obv. 1; K. 559 Obv. 1; K. 545 Obv. 1, 5; 81-2-4, 468 Obv. 1, 5; 81-2-4, 77 Obv. 11; Bu. 91-5-9, 72 Obv. 1; K. 1030 Obv. 1, 3, 6; 83-1-18, 869 Obv. 1; S. 920 Obv. 1, 4; 82-5-2, 111 Obv. 1, 3; K. 5457 Obv. 1, 2; 83-1-18, 122 Obv. 1, 2; 83-1-18, 162 Obv. 1; Bu. 89-4-26, 162 Obv. 1; K. 4734 Obv. 1, 3; 83-1-18, 835 Obv. 1, 3, 4; 83-1-18, 210 Obv. 3; K. 672 Obv. 1, 4, 9; K. 544 Obv. 1, 3, 5, Rev. 6; Bu. 91-5-9, 113 Obv. 1, 4; K. 470 Obv. 1, 3; and 82-5-22, 132 Obv. 1, 3(?); 83-1-18, 29 Obv. 1, 6; Bu. 89-4-26, 63181 Obv. 1, 6.

† The phrase "the king, my lord" is the most common of all titles, occurring from one to thirteen times in every one of the eight hundred and seventy-six letters published by Prof. Robert Francis Harper, except the following one hundred and thirty, to wit, those numbered 10, 15, 38, 54, 62, 65, 70, 112, 117, 132, 145, 147, 183, 185, 214, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 229, 235, 250(?), 273, 283, 287, 288, 289, 290-308, 332, 345, 350(?), 361, 382, 383, 399-403, 409, 416, 417, 422, 430, 435, 447, 448, 449, 451, 457, 461, 464, 466, 470, 472, 473, 477, 478, 490, 505, 512, 517, 518, 523, 527, 537, 540, 543, 559, 561, 567, 571, 574(?), 579, 580, 585(?), 588, 589, 592, 594-7, 601, 607, 609(?), 613, 616, 619 (?), 623, 624, 627, 631, 635, 640, 641, 644, 646, 649, 654(?), 735, 738, 748, 781, 803, 809, 815, 816, 830, 854, 855, 864, 868, 871. In the letters published by S. A. Smith in his *Assyrian Letters* the phrase "the king, my lord" occurs as follows: K. 482 four times, K. 483<sup>4</sup>, K. 82<sup>5</sup>, K. 83<sup>6</sup>,

(41) "I am king of the Kassites and Akkadians, king of the broad land of Babylon." So Ašurbanipal speaks of himself in the inscription published in II R., 38, No. 2, lines 34-36.

(42) "Asurbanipal, the king . . . offspring of the heart of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria . . . grandson of Sennacherib . . ." K. 2867 in S. A. Smith's *Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipal*, II. 1.\*†

31. "Ašurilili, king of nations, king of Assyria." I R., 8, No. 3.

32. "[Sin šar] iškun, the great king, the mighty king, the king of nations, the king of Assyria." I R., 8, No. 6.‡

*Princeton.*

R. D. WILSON.

K. 691<sup>7</sup>, 21<sup>7</sup>, 80<sup>3</sup>, 81<sup>9</sup>, 89<sup>3</sup>, (our lord) 478<sup>3</sup>, 481<sup>3</sup>, 493<sup>4</sup>, 498<sup>5</sup>, 522<sup>4</sup>, 146<sup>2</sup>, 174<sup>5</sup>, 479<sup>2</sup>, 492<sup>6</sup>, 502<sup>6</sup>, 504<sup>9</sup>, 506<sup>4</sup>, 507<sup>3</sup>, 508<sup>3</sup>, 511<sup>4</sup>, 526<sup>3</sup>, 154<sup>4</sup>, 523<sup>4</sup>, 572<sup>3</sup>, 1122<sup>2</sup>, 77<sup>2</sup> and S. 1034<sup>5</sup>. See also Smith's *Keilschrifttexte Asurbanipal's* where it occurs as follows: K. 538<sup>5</sup>, 513<sup>2</sup>, 562<sup>2</sup>, 604<sup>5</sup>, 476<sup>5</sup> [Bu. 2-4, 57]<sup>3</sup>, K. 509<sup>7</sup>, 524<sup>1</sup>, 1064<sup>4</sup>, 11<sup>11</sup>, 549<sup>3</sup>, 183<sup>12</sup>, 487<sup>3</sup>, 525<sup>9</sup>, 646<sup>15</sup>, 550<sup>3</sup>, 1252<sup>3</sup>, S. 760<sup>4</sup>, K. 514<sup>5</sup>, 679<sup>6</sup>, 582<sup>3</sup>, 686<sup>3</sup>, 1229 and 1113<sup>5</sup>, 669<sup>5</sup>, 41.\*\*

\* The periods ( . . . ) denote parts of the inscription which have been destroyed.

† Other titles found in the *Assyrian Letters and Reports* are as follows:

- (1) "My lord, the king, the lord of kings." K. 1202 Obv. 1 and 2.
- (2) "My lord." Bu. 83-1-18, 250; Bu. 91-5-9, 85, lines 3 and 4.
- (3) "The son of the great king, the son of the king of nations (and) of the lands, my lord." Bu. 82-5-22, 103 Obv. 1-3.
- (4) "The son of the king of the lands, my lord." Bu. 82-5-22, 103 Obv. 6.
- (5) "The king of nations"(?). Bu. 89-4-26, 11; Bu. 91-5-9, 93(?), and K. 10489. (See Bezold's *Catalogue*, pages 1092, 1918 and 1938.)
- (6) "King of the lands." Bu. 91-5-9, 73 Obv. 3; K. 544 Rev. 24; Bu. 91-5-9, 85 Obv. 6(?); Bu. 91-5-9, 90 Obv. 1; K. 1196 Obv. 4(?); K. 7426 Obv.
- (7) "The king, the lord of kings, my lord." K. 1202 Obv. 2, 3.
- (8) "The king of the lands, the mighty king, the king of nations." K. 7655, Bezold, 865.
- (9) "The mighty king." K. 6058, Bezold, 759, and K. 3881, Bezold, 573.
- (10) "Lord of lords, king of kings."(?) K. 7593, Bezold, 861.

‡ In the next article, there will be given a collection of titles of the kings of Egypt.

\*\* In this note, the numbers appended to the tablets cited, denote the *number* of times that the phrase is found in each.

## VI.

# REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE.

## I.—PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE.

**PSYCHOLOGY AND COMMON LIFE.** A Survey of the Present Results of Psychical Research, with Special Reference to their Bearings upon the Interests of Everyday Life. By FRANK SARGENT HOFFMAN, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, Union College. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903. 8vo; pp. vii, 286.

This is not a text-book of psychology, new or old, nor is it an argument in support of any special theory or favorite hypothesis of the author. It assumes the correctness of the methods of physio-psychology and it presents what the author regards as some of the assured results of that science. His judgment is careful and his viewpoint conservative. The book is happily free from confusing technicalities of style; and, although evidently written by one who is familiar with the whole subject, is so simple and intelligible that the untrained reader can both understand and enjoy it. The discussion of the brain in its relation to intelligence is based upon the facts of physiology, and yet it avoids anything like an exclusively materialistic interpretation of the functions of thought. While we are told that latest estimates allow 9,200,000,000 nerve cells to the cerebral cortex, yet nothing like the crude "pigeon-hole theory" is contended for. The discussion of dreams and sleep is very interesting. Hypnotism is defined in general as the condition of being lulled to sleep. Some of the indisputable phenomena of hypnotism are set forth, and we are made to see that these are to be accounted for in the same way that we account for similar experiences with which we are familiar, but which are less accentuated in our own consciousness or in our observation. Dr. Mesmer, a medical graduate, almost stumbled upon what turned out to be the beginnings of Mesmerism. Striking instances are cited of the hypnotic cure of idiots and weakminded children. The broad principle is regarded as established that the idea of disease may cause disease, and the idea of health may often dispel disease. The dangerous abuses and the curative uses of hypnotic suggestion are discussed; and Dr. Hoffman believes that, as is already the case in Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, France and Russia, there should be in this country statutory prohibition of the public and indiscriminate practice of hypnotic powers. "The only safe position to take in the matter, from the standpoint of the law, is to regard hypnotism as a poison, and to prohibit its use in public or private except by properly accredited individuals, and then only for scientific ends or as a cure. Its use, like that of strychnia, belladonna or chloroform, if in the hand of the physician, may become a great blessing, but if in that of others, an unmitigated curse" (pp. 157, 158).

The theory of Faith Healing, *et hoc omne genus*, comes in for some attention. The author is very slow to accept all suggested explanations of facts which, as facts, he does accept. He believes that both the cause and the cure of disease are not physical conditions but mental states. Faith Cure differs from Christian Science, in saying that pain and sickness are real; and the author holds that everything of value in either Christian Science or Faith Cure comes from Mental Science. He stands for the psychosis of health and disease, and seems entirely right and safe in insisting that psycho-therapeutics has not the prominence in medical schools which it should have. In his discussion of the hypothesis of the secondary self, Dr. Hoffman is surprisingly conservative. He presents a number of the most striking known instances of the duplicate self, and then tells us that "if we had to choose between the hypothesis of a departed spirit and that of a subliminal self, we should decide for the former" (p. 281). Indeed, he believes in the integrity of Mrs. Piper, but would account for the feats of her mediumship by the principles of telepathy. But Dr. Hoffman seems to us to have a different conception of the subliminal self from that of, say, Prof. James. The one regards it as another self, while the other regards it as another part or tract or state of the same self. The one is the theory of a secondary self along the line of the idea of multiplex personalities; the other is that of an extra-marginal activity escaping the ordinary gaze of the consciousness of the sole self. Given Dr. Hoffman's conception, we are with him in declining it. Prof. James' conception is different, and we are disposed to believe that, without accepting any of the uncanny and unwarranted hypotheses as explanations of the indisputable phenomena that abound in this little-explored and mysterious borderland of physio-psychosis, Prof. Hoffman is almost over-cautious in his attitude toward the rich resources and surprising possibilities of what most psychologists will agree, in general, to call the subconscious self.

Prof. Hoffman is caught napping when he says, "Emerson says somewhere that all men are naturally divided into Platonists and Aristotelians" (p. 50). That famous remark should be credited to Coleridge. In his *Table Talk* (July 2, 1830) he says, "Every man is born an Aristotelian or a Platonist." The same thought is also expressed more fully in a letter of Mr. Coleridge to J. Gooden, Esq. (see vol. iv, p. 399, Dr. Shedd's *Edition of Coleridge's Complete Works*. Harper & Brothers, 1884). Emerson may have said something of the sort, for he said a good many quotable things; but the voice was that of the Sage of Highgate, and whatever came from the Oracle of Concord to the same effect was but an echo.

Trenton.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

---

## II.—APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY.

APOLOGETICS, OR THE RATIONAL VINDICATION OF CHRISTIANITY. By FRANCIS R. BEATTIE, B.D., Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky; Author of *Radical Criticism*, *The Presbyterian Standards*, etc., etc. With an Introduction by BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. In three volumes. Volume I, Fundamental Apologetics. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1903. qto, pp. 605.

This long and eagerly anticipated treatise "seeks to give a somewhat

complete account of the rational grounds upon which the Christian system securely rests." At least in this respect it is almost unique. "We have had many apologies; perhaps no branch of scientific theology has been more fruitful during the past two centuries. But we have had comparatively few surveys of the whole field of Apologetics." We have had no work that even aimed to cover the ground in this science as the three noble volumes of Dr. Charles Hodge, for example, cover it in *Systematic Theology*. Dr. Beattie, therefore, has met a real need.

He has met it, too, uniquely well. His treatise, if we may judge of the promised second and third volumes by the first, is as admirable in its elaboration as it is original in its comprehensiveness. To feel this, it is necessary only to remember the works with which it is most natural to compare it. Perhaps the chief of these would be Prof. H. B. Smith's *Apologetics*, taken in connection with his *Introduction to Christian Theology*, Prof. A. B. Bruce's *Apologetics*, Prof. Rishell's *The Foundations of the Christian Faith*, and Prof. Knox's *The Direct and Fundamental Proofs of the Christian Religion*. Thus Prof. Knox expressly disclaims any intention of defending Christianity as miraculous: he would ignore its claim to be such. Prof. Beattie, however, has no other conception of Christianity than as being the distinctly miraculous religion that it affirms itself to be: it is just because it is miraculous that he finds it adapted, as is no other faith, to the deepest human needs. Again, Prof. Bruce's very able work is vitiated by its concessive spirit and method: though he conceives of Christianity aright, it is its minimum that he would defend. Prof. Beattie, however, regards himself as called on to vindicate, as Prof. Warfield has remarked in his admirable Introduction, "just Christianity itself"; "not the least that we can get along with, and yet manage to call ourselves Christians, but the 'Christian view of the world,' with all that is contained in the 'Christian view of the world' for the science of men." Prof. Rishell's very comprehensive and elaborate treatise is, nevertheless, predominantly negative: it gives far more space to refutation than to vindication, and the argument is often obscured by the multitude of the objections that are answered. Prof. Beattie, on the other hand, is characteristically positive; he would not only defend, but vindicate the Christian religion; instead of beginning with refutation and criticism, he first establishes his own position, and then carries the war into the enemy's country. Nor is his argument ever embarrassed by his material. So strong is his grasp of his subject, so clearly has he discerned its naturally controlling principles, that every detail, falling of itself into the place where it logically belongs, both contributes, to the general effect and can neither be overlooked nor forgotten. In his "Introduction," Dr. Beattie discusses "the Sphere, the Scope, and the Spirit of Apologetics"; "the Definition, the Aim, and the Nature of Apologetics"; "the Place, the Method, and the Divisions of Apologetics"; "Apologetics and the Theory of Knowledge"; "Apologetics and the Philosophy of Belief." This brings us to "the First Part, Fundamental or Philosophical Apologetics." This falls into two divisions. The First Division deals with "the Psychology of Theism." It considers, first, "the Nature of Religious and Theistic Belief"; and, secondly, "the Origin of Religious and Theistic Belief"; discussing under the latter head the Fetichistic Theory, Naturism and Animism, Spiritism and Ancestorism, Henotheism, the Function of Inference with regard to Theistic Belief, Idealistic Evolution, the Function of Revelation with respect to Theistic Belief, and the Accepted Theory of its Origin. The Second Division deals with "the Ontology of Theism." The first section establishes "the Existence of God" by means of "the Psychical Argument," which includes "the Proof from the Auto-

pistic Nature of Theistic Belief," "the Proof from the Idea of a Necessary Being," "the Proof from the Idea of Infinity," and "the Proof from the Principle of Intelligence"; the Cosmical Argument, which comprises "the Proof from Cosmic Origin," "the Proof from Cosmic Progress," "the Proof from Cosmic Order," and "the Proof from Cosmic Design"; and the "Moral Argument," which embraces "the Proof from the Idea of the Right," "the Proof from the Fact of Obligation," "the Proof from the Notion of the Good," and "the Proof from History." This is followed by a consideration of "the Kantian Criticism" and by "a Summary of Theism." The second section takes up the chief antitheistic theories, Atheism, Materialism, Positivism, Agnosticism, Pantheism, Pessimism; describes the varieties of each; estimates the truth in them, and refutes them. Thus closes the First Part and the first volume. "It leads us to construe Christianity in relation to its underlying *philosophy*." The Second and the Third Parts, which, as has been remarked, are yet to be published, present respectively "Christian Apologetics" and "Applied Apologetics"; the former "calling upon us to interpret Christianity in the light of its unique redemptive *history*," and the latter "bidding us test the Christian system by means of its splendid *fruitage in the world*." Such is but a bare outline of this great work. Yet it is sufficient to indicate how comprehensive it is, and how clearly and naturally it has been laid out. Nor is Prof. Beattie's treatise less able to hold its own when compared with such a masterpiece of correct analysis as Prof. Smith's Apologetics. The latter, in distinguishing between "Fundamental Apologetics" and "Philosophical Apologetics," draws a distinction without a difference. This mistake Prof. Beattie never falls into; and, moreover, he has filled out his outline richly and completely, as Prof. Smith did not live to do.

When we examine Prof. Beattie's volume by itself and in detail, we are yet more impressed by its excellences. This is true of its standpoint. In philosophy it bases itself on the ground of rational realism, as against both materialism and idealism. "As to its epistemology, it holds, against empiricism and skepticism, to the rationality of human cognition." "In its philosophy of religion, it maintains a definite vital theism, over against deism and pantheism." "In regard to Christianity, it asserts a well-defined supernaturalism, against all types of naturalism." "As to the essence of Christianity, it finds this in the redeeming activity of God, mediated in the world by Jesus Christ, and administered by the Holy Spirit, as against all other systems of religion." "As to its doctrinal standpoint, it rests confidently on the basis of the historic Reformed system." Its method and spirit are equally admirable. These well illustrate the writer's own teaching on these subjects. He "seeks to cherish, over against a hopeless pessimism, a hopeful meliorism, which believes that things are getting better, and that the world is surely moving on towards that welcome day when the eternal sun of optimism shall brightly shine in a cloudless sky." The style is natural, easy, and appropriate to the subject. Always chaste and dignified, it is transparently clear; and although there is never the least straining after effect, the interest is well sustained. Repetitions are not infrequent, and the reader sometimes regrets a certain lack of terseness; but this is explained and justified in view of the facts that these chapters were prepared from classroom lectures and with the needs of the classroom in mind. This appears also in the very full index, and in the summary of literature which is prefixed to each chapter. These summaries are not exhaustive; they are specially lacking as regards the more recent German apologetic works, but they evince most careful selection; they are evidently intended to guide rather than to embarrass; they give the very books through which the American

or English student would best introduce himself to the vast literature of Apologetics. With respect to the book-making also we can speak only words of praise. The volume is strongly and attractively bound, and lies open easily. The type is clear; the page, beautiful; the printing, accurate. "The Presbyterian Committee of Publication" are to be congratulated on their work as heartily as Dr. Beattie on his. Together they have given us a noble book.

It is, however, one that it is difficult for us to criticise. This, as must have been supposed, is because we find ourselves in such absolute accord with its standpoint, plan, development and conclusions. All that we can do is to call attention in passing to some of its more conspicuous merits. Among these we notice at the outset the conception of Apologetics as "the theological science which presents a systematic defense and vindication of the reality of that divine *redemptive* agency which is resident in, and operative through, Christianity upon the world." This may be termed the "theological and redemptive" conception. It impresses us as superior even to the "Christological and redemptive" conception of H. B. Smith and A. B. Bruce, in that God rather than Christ should be the controlling principle in Apologetics as well as in Dogmatics. Specially helpful also are the analyses of knowledge and of belief and the distinction drawn between them. "It is earnestly insisted that both knowledge and belief have rational grounds, and that both lead to well-grounded convictions of the truth and reality of their objects. But in the case of knowledge the ground bears an internal relation to the conviction, while in the matter of belief the relation is external." Have we not here the whole thing in a nutshell? Admirably, too, is the distinction drawn between the origin of theistic belief and the grounds of theistic belief. Convincing is the refutation of what would seem to be Prof. Flint's position, that theistic belief is ultimately an inference. Equally clear is the account given of "the genesis of theistic belief" as "*within* the human spirit," though not innate in the sense of being complete from the first. Perhaps the strongest portion of the book is that which presents and discusses the theistic proofs. The psychical ones are taken at their full value and discriminatingly. This is peculiarly true of the proof from the principle of intelligence. The cosmical proofs are set forth with rare clearness and freshness. We agree with Prof. Beattie when he says, "Finality is causation looking towards and realizing an end, and the principle of the theological proof consists in an application of the principle of causality to the facts in nature which the term finality denotes. This we take to be a simpler and clearer view than to make finality and causality entirely distinct principles." The moral proofs also are set forth with striking clearness and vigor; and the Kantian criticism of the theistic arguments, as is so seldom the case, is itself criticised not only intelligently, but intelligibly. The treatment of the "Antitheistic Theories" is satisfactory throughout. While the truth in each one of them is fairly admitted, the error is fully exposed. If any distinction can be made, the discussion of deism, and particularly of materialism, is specially excellent. We cannot imagine a better handling of materialism. By no means the least valuable part of this most comprehensive and highly valuable work is Prof. Warfield's Introduction. It is written with even more than his wonted vigor, incisiveness and brilliancy. It is the ablest vindication known to us of the importance and necessity of Apologetics; and when theologians so profound and acute as Dr. Kuyper would almost depreciate it away, there is urgent need of such vindication. The rationalist who holds that man can be saved by his own reason, though a more pronounced, is not a more serious enemy of Christianity than the antirationalist who insists that man is saved by the Holy

Spirit independently of his own reason. There must be the "*argumentum propter quod credo*," as well as the "*principium seu causa efficiens a quo ad credendum adducor*." If without the latter the sinner must continue "dead through trespasses and sins"; so without the former we may say at least this, that the Holy Spirit, at any rate in the case of adults, has not chosen to operate. Though he brings us forth of his own will and by his own power, it is also "by the word of truth" (James i. 18). This truth, these reasons, it is the function of Apologetics to furnish. Hence its *supreme* importance and its *supreme* utility. As it is the Holy Spirit alone who can render souls that are spiritually dead responsive to the truths of the Gospel, so it is ordinarily the office of Apologetics to present these truths in those rational forms in which they may best be responded to. In a word, reason and its demands are essentially the same in the renewed and in the unrenewed man.

The reviewer is prompted to raise just two questions: 1. Does not the Ritschlian epistemology, because of its bearing on the theistic proofs, call for special treatment? Of course, this epistemology is ruled out by the author's true doctrine on this subject, and it is by implication refuted in the discussion of positivism. Its peculiar prominence at the present day, however, would seem to demand definite discussion. Perhaps it is to be so treated in the second volume.

2. Is it a just criticism of idealistic evolution that it has "to explain the higher out of and by means of the lower"? We join most heartily in the author's other admirable and fatal strictures on this pretentious scheme. In the one under notice, however, he seems to us to go too far. In our view, what makes idealistic evolution so formidable is that it does clear the great snag presented by materialistic evolution. Dialectic rather than mechanical, it is not an evolving of one thing out of a different and lower thing; it is rather the progressive unfolding of the real meaning of the universal thing, the Absolute Idea. This idea may be, as it is, an impossible abstraction; but granted its reality, there would seem to be no more difficulty in conceiving of it as manifesting itself in successively higher and finally in conscious and even self-conscious forms, than in thinking of a music box as so constructed as to pass from unrelated noises to simple and then to the most complex harmonies. Hence, we do not have "an effect without a cause." Undoubtedly, "the immanent dialectic" is a fancy; but if it were a reality, it would be an adequate cause. A proposition in geometry, if it is to be demonstrated, demands a geometer; but it demands this for its conception as well as for its demonstration. If, as the transcendental idealist holds, it were itself alive, it would need no outside cause; for its very nature would be to unfold and so demonstrate itself.

In conclusion, the reviewer would congratulate Dr. Beattie most heartily on his work. He has rendered the whole Church of Christ, and particularly all ministers and students for the ministry, as well as teachers of Apologetics, a great service. It is a grand thing that in this "age of doubt" and of loose thinking, especially on fundamental themes, so sound, so comprehensive, and so able a treatise on these themes should go out. May he soon issue the promised volumes, for which we are all eagerly waiting. Though the professor may find that he himself can teach more effectively in the use of his own if not so well-organized material, still he needs them for guidance and for stimulus. He needs them also to place in the hands of every one of his students for reference. Moreover, the whole Church needs them, that we may all "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." We rejoice to think that Dr. Beattie is still in the vigor of life. The work before us is really the fruit of his early manhood, and of

one of unusually varied productivity. May the years more than fulfill the promise of his youth!

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

CHRISTIAN FAITH IN AN AGE OF SCIENCE. By WILLIAM NORTH RICE, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Geology in Wesleyan University. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 3 and 5 West Eighteenth Street, near Fifth Avenue. 1903. \$vo; pp. xi, 425.

That there is or could be any conflict between Christian faith and science, no one of intelligence believes for a moment. That, however, the relations between them are often strained because of what seem to be difficulties in the way of harmonizing them, is just as evident. There are in general three methods of resolving these difficulties. The first would set aside or ignore even the facts of science in the interest of the traditional interpretations of the Christian faith. This was the method of the Church when she forced Galileo to deny the revolution of the earth around the sun. It is a method which our author earnestly and ably opposes, and it is one which we, and the Church of to-day as a whole, repudiate as heartily as he. Facts in any sphere are revelations from God, and in a true sense of God; and, therefore, the faith which does not accept them is as unchristian as it is irrational. The second method would reject or pass over the plain meaning of the Christian faith, even as embodied in the Bible, in the interest of the current theories of men of science. Thus Dr. Rice, for example, recognizes that "the changes in our thought of the universe cannot but work corresponding changes in our thought of God and of his revelation to man. We have ceased to look to the Bible for a revelation of the plan and history of the universe, or to regard the Bible as inerrant. The 'carpenter God' has vanished from a universe which we have come to regard as a growth and not as a building. The metaphysical dogma of the duality of essence in human nature has been rendered uncertain by the tendencies of biological science. Evolutionary anthropology must regard the fall of man as potential rather than actual. The tendencies of scientific thought have compelled us to reject as unhistoric some of the Biblical narratives of miracle, and to regard others as more or less doubtful" (*vid. p. 403*).

This method of harmonizing the apparent difficulties between Christian faith and science seems to us unsatisfactory for several reasons:

1. It is a virtual surrender of the Christian faith. Dr. Rice is mistaken when he claims (p. 400) that the changes of belief just indicated "involve the abandonment of no essential doctrine of Christianity. A Heavenly Father, a risen Saviour, an inspired and inspiring Bible, an immortal hope, are still ours." Unless words are to be used in new meanings, God cannot be heavenly if He does not transcend the universe; but He cannot transcend the universe if His relation to all that goes on in it must be the same (p. 337). The divine immanence thus conceived makes God nothing more than the soul of the world, and as such He would be less capable of being regarded as our Heavenly Father, or even as our Father, than if he were only a "carpenter God." "A risen Saviour" cannot be believed in, however strong may be the evidence of his resurrection, if, as Dr. Rice would seem to hold, all things, even the origin of life, must be brought under the law of natural evolution (p. 249). Nor may it be replied that the absolute uniqueness of Christ's character breaks the force of this objection. The very point of the Scripture doctrine of the resurrection is that Christ's body was not unique, but was a true body of flesh and blood, a body assumed by our Lord because it could die, a body which was subject to the laws of nature and which,

under those laws, could never rise. "An inspired and inspiring Bible" cannot be errant and often unhistorical. It is true, as Baronius said, "that the Scriptures were given, not to teach us how the heavens go, but to teach us how to go to heaven." We could not, however, trust any information as to the latter, unless it was manifestly from God himself: and it could not be from God at all if it were mixed with mistakes as to the former; for God being the creator and governor of the heavens, as well as of the heaven, as Dr. Rice holds most positively (p. 337), He must know as much concerning the one as concerning the other. So, too, we lose "our immortal hope" if we accept our author's monistic philosophy. At least, we cannot say with Paul, "To be absent from the body is to be at home with the Lord": for according to monism, "the two orders of phenomena that constitute our dual life inhere in a single essence" (p. 266); and so when the body is dead, as during the intermediate state, the ego itself must be dead, inasmuch as body and ego are in essence one. In a word, while our author is anxious to save the Christian faith, and while he sincerely believes that he has done so, he has succeeded in appearance only. His science may not "touch" the central truth itself of Christianity, but it would discredit its presuppositions and so undermine it.

2. This virtual surrender of the Christian faith is needless. Science does not demand that the presuppositions of our religion should be given up. Neither does philosophy. The divine immanence, for example, is not exclusive of the divine transcendence. Because "all things live and move and have their being in God," it does not follow that He is not above all things and independent of them. Because nothing happens save by His will and with His support, it does not follow that "He does everythiug or nothing." That evolution is a universal dynamic law need not imply that there is no other dynamic law. In the nature of the case, there is no reason why God should not have planned evolution with reference to supernatural intervention. That all things must be referred ultimately to the good pleasure of His will argues nothing as to how He will accomplish that will, whether naturally or supernaturally or in both ways. Because the facts of geology demand a much greater antiquity for the human race than Archbishop Usher allows, it need not be inferred that the Bible itself is wrong. Archbishop Usher assumed that in the genealogical tables in Genesis each name marked one generation. These tables, however, were not designed "to give the regular succession of births in a given line, but simply to mark the descent." In a word, the Scriptures do not teach how long men have existed on the earth. What their genealogical tables do prove—and all that they were intended to prove—is that "Christ was the son of David and of the seed of Abraham" (*vid. The Pentateuch Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso*, by William Henry Green, p. 132). Because there are "three seeming interruptions in the continuity of nature—between non-living and living, between unconscious and conscious, between non-human and human"—it does not follow that monism is a more rational theory than dualism: it rather follows that triadism, if we may coin a term, would be. In a word, the theories which would, as we have seen, undermine the Christian faith are as needless as they are destructive. They are not necessitated by the facts.

3. They are positively unscientific. That is, they are contradicted by the facts. The three gaps, for example, just referred to in the continuity of development are inconsistent with the position that God acts only through evolution. Their significance is that they are breaks in the chain of evolution. With life, with consciousness, with man, something new, not merely as to degree, but as to kind appears. Hence, a new cause—a cause other

than nature, a supernatural cause—is demanded. To take a different view is to repudiate utterly the scientific method. Nor may it be argued that since all the other facts can be explained by the theory of evolution, these few gaps may be overlooked. On the contrary, these are the very facts which may not be overlooked: they are the crucial ones; it is precisely at the ditch that the bridge is needed. Nor may the incompleteness of the geological record be urged at this point: for if this be done, it will be in order to bring forward the incompleteness of the Biblical record. That no mistakes might appear in the Scriptures if we were in possession of all the facts unrecorded, must be admitted by one who argues that no gaps would be found in the chain of evolution if all the fossils were before us. Still further, it is utterly unscientific to contend against supernatural intervention in the course of nature when, as by our author, human intervention, as at the origin of sin, and in every exercise of free-will, is insisted on. Indeed, nothing could be more inconsistent for a thoroughgoing evolutionist than Dr. Rice's position on these two questions. He holds that if the will is to act freely, it cannot be determined by, and so of course cannot be the result of, the man's character; that freedom, though potential, is rarely actual; and that when one really acts freely, it is at those moral crises when he acts against nature (p. 299). Of these crises the greatest and the most terrible was when man in the abuse of his freedom introduced the potency of evil into the stream of development (p. 284); an act, moreover, which, inasmuch as our author repudiates the doctrine of the imputation of sin and minimizes that of the transmission of its effects, is repeated essentially in the case of every individual. How any one can stumble at supernatural intervention after this it is hard to see.

The third and, as we think, the true method of regarding the apparent conflict between the Christian faith and science would, on the one hand, interpret the Bible in accordance with all the facts of science; and on the other, would control the theories, and especially the hypotheses, of science by the plain meaning of the Word of God; and in view of continued difficulties, would resolutely believe that they were not such in reality, but appeared such only because of the necessary limitation of our knowledge. The justice of this position would seem to be self-evident. God would not be *God*, if facts could mislead us; the Bible could not be the latest revelation from Him, if it either contradicted or were not meant to supplement and interpret His revelation in nature; and that the harmony between the two should be at once or completely discernible, is too much for finite and especially for sinful creatures like ourselves to expect. Hence the importance, as Dr. Rice urges (p. 409), of the union of inquiry and practical belief; only let not the former be determined by that "theoretical skepticism," which he also counsels. There is no reason for the investigation of nature, unless God be a reasonable being; and if He be a reasonable being, and the Bible in any true sense His Word, then it will be as we trust, and not as we distrust it, that we shall understand His works.

A line or two must be given in closing to our author's view of the kind of apologetics demanded by our scientific age. "The verification of belief," he says (p. 398), "must be sought, not in a single invincible line of argument, but in the conformity of the belief to an assemblage of multitudinous phenomena—in the convergence of lines of evidence drawn from different and apparently unconnected classes of facts." In this Dr. Rice is correct. He is wrong, however, in regarding the need of this kind of apologetics as a discovery of his own or even of the twentieth century. This was precisely the method introduced by Bishop Butler in the eighteenth century and described in words very like those of our author (*vid. Analogy*, Pt. 2, C. vii).

If, however, Dr. Rice is correct as to the kind of apologetics required by our age, we cannot believe him correct as to what he calls "the foundation of Christian apologetics" (p. 401). This is not Christ, as he would have it, but God. Christ would not say to the doubters of our day, "Ye believe in me; believe also in God." He would still say, just as He said at the first, "Ye believe in God; believe also in Me." As Pres. Patton has well observed (*PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW*, Vol. II, No. 5, p. 115): "Christ can teach theism to an atheist to-day only by an inferential passage from the phenomena of His earthly life to belief in the Divine existence. But if the phenomena of the universe are powerless to produce this result, it is vain, so at least it seems to me, to suppose that the phenomena of a single life can produce it."

While, however, we are thus obliged to differ radically from the book under review, we would not deny either its ability or its value. It gives in compact form a singularly clear history of the progress of science, and it fairly represents the tendencies of many of its theories in their relation to the Christian faith.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

INDIVIDUAL IMMORTALITY. By EMMA MARIE CAILLARD, Author of *Progressive Revelation*, etc. London: John Murray, 1903. Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 136. [Also four papers in *The Contemporary Review* for 1902 and 1903 (reprinted in *The Living Age* for Aug. 16, Sept. 20, Oct. 18, 1902, and July 18, 1903), which contain four out of the five chapters of the book.]

IMMORTALITY A RATIONAL FAITH. The Predictions of Science, Philosophy and Religion on a Future Life. By WILLIAM CHESTER, Former Co-pastor of Phillips Presbyterian Church, New York City, and Former Pastor of Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Milwaukee, Wis. Chicago, New York and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. [1903.] 8vo, pp. 257.

It is perhaps symptomatic of the state of religious thought in our day, not that the fundamental religious problems are renewedly brought up for discussion,—for that happens and will always happen whenever there is any vital interest in religion,—but that they tend to be discussed apart from, or with relatively slight reference to, the Christian revelation. The two discussions of Immortality now before us illustrate, each in its own degree, this tendency; and despite very great differences in form and matter, they have much in common, considered as attempts to suggest the rational grounds of faith in human immortality. Both pass in review in turn the scientific, philosophical and ethical considerations, relegating the purely Christian grounds of belief to at least the background—although Miss Caillard both opens and closes her discussion with an outline of what she deems the true Christian conception of immortality, and Mr. Chester at least closes his with something very similar, under the title of "conditions of life after death." Both agree that empirical science, so far from forbidding the hope of immortality, creates a presumption for it: that this presumption is raised to a high probability by philosophy: and that this probability is made a moral certainty by ethico-religious considerations. And both agree in conceiving the immortality thus pointed to as an immortality of activity and progress. Both neglect either altogether or in large part the Christian doctrine of resurrection, and discuss the problem of immortality very much as if it concerned the soul alone. Miss Caillard seeks to bring a real

contribution to the solution of the problem and writes with easy command of her vehicle, and if in somewhat involved, yet always in quiet and clear sentences. Mr. Chester evidently cherishes no such lofty ambition; his purpose is merely to popularize the common arguments and he has a distinctly general audience in view. He lacks somewhat in precision whether of thought or statement, and clothes his ideas in a rhetoric which forcibly recalls that of Dr. Hillis. Neither writer appears to us to make the best of the rational argument for immortality: and the deficiencies of their arguments are characteristically covered up, by Miss Caillard with a profusion of hypotheses, by Mr. Chester with bursts of declamation,—in which, though the nominatives and verbs are not always exactly adjusted to each other, we are left in no doubt that he is ever “bound for the happy land of Canaan.”

Neither author, of course, attempts anything like a rational demonstration of human immortality: they pretend to discover intimations only, but intimations which they consider to be capable of producing a moral certainty. In assuming this attitude they are assuredly wise, though it does not always seem to be clearly apprehended precisely why no rational demonstration of immortality can be looked for. The truth is, of course, that immortality is a fact that occurs and not an ontological truth: and there is no *à priori* road to the establishment of occurrences. Whether men live after death cannot be authoritatively determined from the nature of the soul as simple, nor from the greatness of its endowments, nor from the apparently disciplinary character of this life, nor even from the seeming incompleteness of human existence on earth. Undoubtedly a valid probable argument may be raised upon such considerations. But the test is after all, as Mr. Chester perceives, just experience: of a historical fact, as distinguished from an ontological necessity, the test is always just experience. It does not follow, however, that this experience must be our personal experience; so that each of us must wait until he dies in order to find out whether he shall live after death. Experience is the sole test of historical facts; but testimony is the proper channel by which experience is communicated to others: and Mr. Chester does not seem fully to realize this. The appropriate proof of the reality of life after death to us, therefore, is not rational argumentation—however valuable this may be in allaying prejudice and preparing the mind for the admission of the proper evidence—but just adequate testimony to the matter of fact.

One traveler beyond that bourne who returns: one voice from the other side of the grave: this would be evidence which, when accredited to the soul, would once and for all by the proper proof settle the matter of the occurrence of life after death. Of course, the question of how many of those that die live still after death—whether the whole of mankind, or a part greater or smaller—would require its own appropriate evidence to determine. But this is an element of detail: the main point is whether “death ends all,” or the soul actually persists in living after the decay of the body: and the appropriate evidence of this is just the testimony of those who have experience of the matter. And this is why the somewhat slighting way in which the resurrection of Christ is set to one side by Mr. Chester (Miss Caillard ultimately does more justice to it) bears such deep significance. We might as well settle it in our minds once for all, that accredited testimony is the appropriate evidence of matters of fact, and that, therefore, when matters of fact are under discussion it is for accredited testimony, not for rational intimations, that we should fundamentally look. From this point of view we have a certain amount of sympathy with Mr. Myers and his colleagues in the investigation of phantasms of the dead and the phenomena of so-called spiritism. They are at least in search of evidence of the appropriate order.

But we thank Mr. Chester for this much at least—that he does not suggest that the testimony of a “Phinuit and his Mrs. Piper” would weigh with him more than that of Jesus Christ. Miss Caillard has not resisted the temptation to make some slight allusions to this line of research, blind as it is, but, of course, only allusions: she finds her demonstration only in our Lord’s resurrection, concerning which she has some strong and true things to say.

Stated after a more theological fashion, the reason why a rational demonstration of human immortality is unattainable is that this is a matter that depends on the purpose of God and is not a necessity of nature. Only if necessary existence could be postulated of the soul could we obtain a rational demonstration of its persistence. But the soul is not self-existent, but, to put it baldly, just a manufactured article: and because it is a manufactured article it is dependent for its persistence in being as well as for its coming into being upon the will of its Maker. Miss Caillard sees this well enough, and, being intent on her proof of immortality and very fertile in hypotheses, she meets the difficulty by denying apparently that the soul is a manufactured article. The soul, she seems to suggest, always was, even as it always shall be. She has chosen the only way of escape. You cannot infer of a soul that was made, that it cannot be unmade at the pleasure of its Maker. And you can know nothing of the pleasure of its Maker save as it is His pleasure to reveal it to us. This revelation may be given in part no doubt in the nature of the soul He has created, in the powers with which He has endowed it, in the aspirations which He has implanted in it, in the manner of His dealing with it, and the like. But it will be a great thing if to all these suggestions of His purpose He has added a manifest declaration of it, sealed with an example: too great a thing to be neglected in our estimate of the evidences of the persistence of the soul after death. This too, happily, Miss Caillard has seen and, before she closes, she does some sort of justice to it.

The nature of our dissatisfaction with these two books has doubtless already emerged. Although in greatly different degrees, neither seems to us to exhibit quite a sound estimate of the relative values of different kinds of evidence. The evidence for the historical fact that Christ rose from the dead, the evidence for the trustworthiness of the Scriptures as a revelation from God, are indefinitely stronger and more direct than the “rational proof” of human immortality. Christ Jesus brought life and immortality to light in the highest and truest sense: and, though without the revelation made in and through Him, we may hope for and cherish a well-grounded expectation of it, it is only in this revelation that we may be finally assured of it. We gain nothing by treating it as if it were a fact assured to us independently of the historical revelation of God. If indeed we were addressing heathen it might be another matter. But even then it would undoubtedly be better, in the first instance, to present Christ to them than immortality. When God the Lord was training a people to be His people, He did it not by convincing them of immortality, let us remember, but by revealing to them Himself: of all peoples, faith in a hereafter for the soul seems to have counted least just with the Israelites. But when we are addressing men and women trained under fundamentally Christian influences, as even Miss Caillard and especially Mr. Chester are doing, it surely betrays a very odd estimate of the relative weight of the several bodies of evidence that immortality should be argued primarily on rational grounds. We may be well assured that no one who loses his hold on the revelation of God in Christ—or on the historical revelation of the Scriptures—will be likely to retain a lively belief in immortality.

There are two other things we feel bound to emphasize from the Christian standpoint before we are done. One concerns the nature of the immortality

which is presented to us. In Mr. Chester distinctly, and in Miss Caillard primarily, the "immortality of the soul occupies the chief attention." But that is a purely heathen idea. Christianity knows nothing of an "immortality of the soul." It proclaims the immortality of the man. Miss Caillard does not close until she rises to the persistence of man in life in his human completeness: but the Christian doctrine of the resurrection is reserved even by her for the end of the discourse. Throughout the main argument of both it is the soul and the soul only that is kept distinctly in view. The sole direct evidences of immortality we have, however, concern not the soul, but the whole man—the instance of Christ, the revelations of the Word of God. Nor has philosophy, nor yet science, anything to urge in opposition. Herbert-Spencer himself tells us that a perfect organism in perfect correspondence with its environment would know no decay: and Weismann has of late declared that it is not persisting life, but death, that needs accounting for in organisms. From the Christian point of view, at all events, the "immortality of the soul" only has no standing ground in discussion. And the discussion can only gain in cogency, if from the beginning it is human immortality, and not "the immortality of the soul," that is kept firmly in view.

Again, what are we to say of the slight sense of sin and of sin's effects that is exhibited? Both writers adopt and proclaim with a fervor worthy of a better cause the notion that is commonly known as the doctrine of "eternal hope." Mr. Chester affirms, "This is not Universalism, for Universalism declares that this is true, while we hope this may be true." Then he demands, "Who dares dogmatically declare that God in His vast plans may not ultimately, after justice is fully satisfied, seek the penitence, transformation and perfection of wayward souls?" The answer is easy. Among others, Jesus Christ. The same Jesus Christ who brought life and immortality to light, but whose testimony in word and deed on that subject also Mr. Chester scarcely deigns to use. And think of what is involved in the phrase, "After justice is fully satisfied"! Does Mr. Chester imagine that the sin of man is so easily expiated? Miss Caillard takes vastly more account of sin and its fruits than Mr. Chester, but equally surpasses him in the fertility of her hypotheses. She, too, cherishes the "eternal hope" as a reality for all, but will not permit any soul to issue from the trammels of time into the eternity which she equates with "immortality" until it is freed from that evil which, as it is "eternally repudiated by the Divine will," "has no place out of time." If we understand her, she calls in a kind of transmigration doctrine and conceives of the sinful soul living over and over again in this temporal sphere, "treading and treading again the terrible circle, without release and without remedy, save in the unique, unchangeable relationship which each finite individual ideally bears to God, and which no temporal lapse can obscure to Him," until at last "it commences ever so feebly to repudiate evil and choose good,"—when "this relationship" "has power to redeem and restore the lost spirit." Miss Caillard here presents the more definite view, but Mr. Chester's vagueness has certainly its advantages.

We must not permit ourselves to go into more details. Enough has assuredly been said to indicate why we can give only a partial commendation to either book. Despite Miss Caillard's suggestiveness and Mr. Chester's earnestness, and the real interest of the argument as presented by both, we think that he who is seeking an acceptable statement of the rational evidence for immortality would better find it in such well-grounded summaries as—to name no others—that, say, in Dr. Orr's *Christian View of God and the World* (pp. 177 sq.), or that in Dr. A. H. Strong's *Systematic Theology*

(pp. 555 *sq.*). In such summaries it is presented with clearness and force, and yet with proper guarding and without obscuration of higher matters.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

#### THE DIRECT AND FUNDAMENTAL PROOFS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

An Essay in Comparative Apologetics, Based upon the Nathaniel William Taylor Lectures for 1903. Given before the Divinity School of Yale University. By GEORGE WILLIAM KNOX, Professor of the Philosophy and History of Religion in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903. 8vo; pp. viii, 196.

The standpoint of these lectures is unique. In his preface the lecturer takes care to declare that they are not in any sense a full setting forth of his own faith, which, "excepting its fundamental principle, is, for the purpose of this argument, what Prof. James calls 'over-beliefs'" (p. viii). Furthermore, he concedes that these lectures do not meet the difficulties most apparent to the majority of Christians, nor do they adequately represent their faith. He regards the ground of the new apologetics as very different from that of the old. The difference grows out of the modern view of the world. The old apologetics minimizes intellectual changes and assumes a great deal that scientific men are now denying, while the new falls in with the modern world-view, thus abandoning or ignoring much that the old holds as essential. These lectures take their stand on the new ground. The question considered is not whether the Christian Religion is true for Dr. Knox, or for the majority of doubt-troubled Christians; but is it true for the man who entirely accepts the modern view of things? The lecturer's task is a vicarious one. He speaks not *in propria persona* as a truth-seeker or as a truth-finder; he speaks in the interest of one who stands elsewhere and sees otherwise. It is an interesting instance of theological ventriloquism.

Dr. Knox reminds us that he is indebted to Bishop Butler for the title of his essay, and that to him and to his age miracles were "the direct and fundamental proofs." But it is so no longer. Then the object of the proof was the medium of the message of the Christian Religion; now it is the contents of that message. The ground is changed; old presuppositions are no longer combated; it is not worth while, they are simply ignored. The modern view is largely Spinozistic in its Pan-entheism, while Hume, forsaking the common ground in the old Deistic controversy, is the only man of his age who appeals with any force to the strictly scientific spirit of our age. The state of the case concerning miracles is, not so much that they are not proven as that they are not considered. The new apologetics need not prove miracles true in order thus to prove Christianity true; let it go at once to the point and prove Christianity itself true. Miracles are extraneous and aside from the point; let them go or stay as may be. All this being so, the new apologetics must choose from the three methods open to its choice: it can defy the new world-view; it can modify its old positions with reference to it; or it can heartily accept it and address itself to the problem anew. This last is the course essayed in these lectures.

In testing the truth of Christianity, the methods must be precisely those employed in testing truth anywhere. All theory, doctrine, philosophy, science, must be tested at the bar of concrete facts. Not everybody has the competency which entitles them to an opinion, but when all who have the right agree, then the opinion may be regarded as established and we may label it *truth*. Further back than this it is useless to attempt to go. Worth-estimate is the sufficient, final and, indeed, only available test. A new metaphysics is coming, built and building upon the ascertained facts of

psychology and epistemology. This, by the by, is the pious ignoring of all genuine metaphysics, which is not exactly a new thing under the sun but which is the implicit surrender of traditional theism. A purely empirical metaphysics is no metaphysics; but no matter about that, the new world-spirit or world-view demands and commands it, and it is for the saving of the faith of this that we are now working. The test of all truth is, Will it work? Will my opinion work out well into practice? This is not exactly the *Cui bono?* of Utilitarianism, but it is the *Will it work?* of Pragmatism. And to this test the Christian Religion must submit itself in the truth searchings of the new apologetics.

This sends us at once to history. In the historical conflict of religions the test reveals itself in the survivals and victories which are recorded. The long contest between Confucianism and Buddhism in China is instanced and fully discussed as illustrative of this principle. Coming to the Christian Religion, it is frankly conceded that no definition can be framed on any basis of general agreement as to its nature, its essential teaching or its history. In the absence of this, he seizes upon the next best thing, an essential note of Christianity, namely, Love. There follows a fine lecture upon this as a central feature of Christianity. Coming on to the test of fact, it follows from the very nature of the Christian Religion that it is not to be considered simply as what it is, but what it is for; what it aspires to be and what it assists men to be, can be tested by a large view of all the facts. Christian civilization is not Christian, nor is the Christian Church purely Christian. The fundamental teaching of Christianity is not of an all-pervading or self-existent substance, else metaphysical inquiry were the way to God and Christ's highest teaching were of His eternal substance and relation to the Father. Neither is that fundamental teaching of power, else miracle were the proof and obedience our first duty. It can only be in "a supreme act of self-sacrifice." "So that the direct and fundamental proof of Christianity as religion can be only in the life and death of Jesus Christ as the revelation of the Christian God" (p. 144). This furnishes the new ground needed for the latter-day apologetics. Questions of inspiration and revelation are far removed from it. Discussions of the Bible, interpretations of Christ as the Logos, or as the Sinless One, or as the Second Person of the Trinity, are simply not *ad rem*. These belong to theology; "and apologetics cannot rest its case on theories of His Person or of the Book, but in the love of Christ revealed, which makes men triumphant over sin and fear and death" (p. 160). Even agnosticism may come within the pale, since "some theologians as agnostic as Huxley, and others as gnostic as Hegel, have equally trusted the divine love revealed in Christ in life and death, and have taken it as their rule of conduct toward their fellow-man" (p. 160). The question is, Will Christianity work? And it will. It meets men's needs. It fits into the facts as man knows them, and it meets the situation as he understands it. "Thus, though some may regret it, the direct and fundamental proofs of our religion can be found only in its satisfaction of the religious cravings of the soul, and by its adaptation to the highest wants of society through its ethical activities" (p. 173). This test is applied to the four religions which claim to be in possession of the truth, namely, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Mohamedanism; and each is found wanting. The solitary contemplations of Hinduism may do as a protest against absorption in trivialities, but as a working theory of life for all men it breaks down. Buddhism would fain conquer the world by fleeing it, but its ideals are bankrupt and Nirvana is its cowardly goal. Confucianism, without any principle of progress, contemplates only the superior few and hence fails as a working theory for mankind. Mohamedanism is historically

too closely allied with Christianity to be any fair rival, but, even so, its position is stationary and its standards are repellent and impossible. The trial of Christianity reveals its permanent and indisputable superiority. Its goal is perfection—a goal encouraging limitless progress, with immortal developments in its promise.

These lectures are not without value as a specimen of what can be done on the new ground. Perhaps they are the best possible, perhaps not. But, in any case, they raise a few questions which relate in general to the new apologetical position and method.

1. If the new apologetics is no longer concerned with the medium but only with the contents of Christianity's message, how is it that in testing Christianity we must abandon all attempts to frame a definition showing what those very contents are, but must satisfy ourselves with a consideration of its merits only from the standpoint of one of its essential characteristics—of which there may be some or many more?

2. If the established facts of the world-order are to be the tribunal for testing religions, must we forget that men who claim to be competent—and who shall be deemed competent to pass on their own or other men's, competency?—differ widely in their judgment as to what those facts are, and that the only escape from the renounced metaphysical element in reading and interpreting the facts is in the pit of Positivism, whence even the new apologetics would hardly argue that any religious excellence may be expected to come?

3. Are we to join in the movement of the new order, abandoning miracles as a signatory confirmation of the truth of Christianity, on the ground that Christianity is one thing and miracle another, and so forsake the scriptural and rational teaching that the miracles themselves, rightly regarded, constitute an integral part of the complete conception of Christianity?

4. Are we to accept the teaching of the lecturer, cropping out incidentally again and again, that theology is but the philosophy, or the philosophical explanation or rationale, of religion,—thus making a historical phenomenon, a social or institutional or moral or immoral force and fact in history, the subject-matter of theological study and apologetical inquiry, rather than the True and Living God who makes Himself known, not only in the objective history of the past, but also in ways which the inquiring mind clearly and gratefully apprehends but which a positivistic apologetics is blind to?

5. Are we to believe that if the direct and fundamental proof of Christianity is in the fact that it meets the needs of man—a test of utility pure and simple—and if, as we are often reminded, these needs develop and change in the progress of the race, then Christianity's proof to-day may fail it to-morrow and the key that fits the lock now, whether it be of iron or brass or silver or gold, with the changes that may come in the lock itself, will be something different after a time; seeing either that Christianity will fit the changed needs of men then and hence, *ipso facto*, will be different from the Christianity of to-day, or that it will not fit mankind's needs then and, *ipso facto*, will fail of the formal test of religion at any time?

It may be well to prove Christianity true to the new world-view, but it is also well to see to it that it is a true Christianity which has been proven. One apologetics claims nearly everything and concedes nearly nothing, and *vice versa*; but in deciding what we will claim and what concede, we are hardly left free to consult our own discretion or even the new world-view. There must be more of what the new spirit scorns as "over-beliefs" in the undefined "contents," or the modern apologetics has only a fool's task to perform. A Christianity which does not present more of Sin and Salvation and Faith and Atonement and New Birth and the Holy Spirit, caring less,

if need be, what may be the judgment of the Philistines concerning its inferiority or superiority to other faiths among men, will not satisfy Christendom; it is no wonder it does not satisfy the lecturer; we do not believe that it will convince the new spirit,—and even if it does, of what is it convinced? Christianity will hold its own; we have no fear about that. It has survived many “new world-views” and it is not worn out yet. Seeing that many glory after the manner of the new age, we may, perhaps, glory also; but we must not forget that a Christianity whose contents are indefinable and whose truth must be tested by a movable scale, may inveigle us into speaking “not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly.”

Trenton.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

---

### III.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By JOHN EDGAR MCFADYEN, M.A., B.A., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in Knox College, Toronto. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903. Pp. 376.

Prof. McFadyen is correct in representing, the Church to-day as face to face with a most serious crisis in the problem of biblical criticism; that the present issue is of the gravest character; that it is by no means an academic one, but touches the most profound and sacred interests of men. We join in his lament that energies must be so largely consumed on questions which do not constitute the positive and essential mission of the Church.

The book presents in popular form the principles of the Old Testament Criticism and the methods of its work, and its bearings upon certain vital elements in the Christian faith. The author writes with equipoise and in admirable spirit, and with a scholar's equipment and acumen. He aims to set forth the positions of the two camps now in opposed array, if we may so speak, over the Scriptures, and throughout to show for himself a sympathetic attitude towards the great verities of revelation.

The scope of the book, to a large degree, appears reportorial. Page after page states what the critics of to-day propound in their postulates, their deductions, and their arguments. But it is difficult to be dispassionate and a mere “setter forth.” And such favorable showing does the critics' side receive, and with such skill and such enthusiasm is it presented, that long before we finish reading we find the author has left the rôle of reporter for that of advocate and exponent.

He confesses a difficulty in finding a suitable designation for those who, relative to the critics, are of the “party of the other part.” He does not want to call them “traditionalists,” as that might be invidious. Elsewhere, however, though perhaps inadvertently, they are thus designated: “supporters of the traditional view”; “those who identify themselves with what may be called the traditional opinions” (Chap. XI.). He hesitates, likewise, about the term “conservatives,” as not being always a popular word. He lines up the two parties, and generally so designates them throughout the book as “the critics, and their opponents”—which conclusion of the matter is itself not without significance.

He touchingly pleads for reverence in dealing with those Scriptures which “come to us weighted with solemn and mysterious dignity,” and for fairness and mutual respectfulness in the controversy. He has a whole chapter on the “Discourtesies of Criticism,” as exhibited by many of the participants

in the debate—deploring the Critic Duhm's characterizing the 119th Psalm as “the emptiest production that ever blackened paper,” and the dictum of another that it is only persons “lacking in the literary sense” who take the early books of the Old Testament as statements of fact, and declaring that Dr. Briggs had not helped his argument by saying “no respectable commentator” would now countenance a certain interpretation of Genesis VI. (Far more grievous offenses of this kind on the part of Dr. B. could have been seen, if desired, in his once-famous “Inaugural,” in Union Seminary history.) But as the Psalmist found the smiting of the righteous a kindness, and his reproving as oil upon the head, so the “opponents of the critics” ought to recognize a special debt of gratitude, inasmuch as the instances in which their plain-spoken judgments are excepted to by the author are not only much more numerous but fall under a severer censure.

The nature and methods and function of criticism are very lucidly discussed. What is meant by “the historical method” is well put forth, and in fascinating style. In this respect alone, apart from one's impression of it as a whole, the book is of great value. There has been much unwise hostility to the higher criticism which has come from a defective and very blurred conception of the subject. The author, however, is at fault in his chapter “The Essence of Protestantism” in making it, as it were, a prototype or forerunner of the modern critical attitude towards the Scriptures. He represents that 16th century phenomenon too much as if only the exponent of intellectual unrest and challenge, and of the spirit of freedom, with too little emphasis placed on its positiveness of religious conviction and its vast constructive force. Protestantism was one of the world's mightiest organic movements, and meant much more than the avowal in Goethe's Faust, “I am the spirit that evermore denies.” That great religious Reformation which shook whole continents is not to be estimated or measured by the etymology of a word which described but a single incident in its history. And Luther's occasional cautious utterances concerning certain parts of the Bible must be taken along with his more heartfelt and more characteristic avowal, “My conscience is a captive to God's word!”

The Professor maintains, that in the conclusions of the present-day critics there is a substantial unanimity; that any differences of opinion which may appear among them do not pertain to the fundamental issue; that it is only a superficial view of the subject that can see in these divergencies any weakness of the critical position as a whole; and that a consensus of opinion and a substantial harmony has now been reached on all the larger questions. As such he enumerates: The composition of the Hexateuch and, to a degree, of all the historical books; the three codes of the Pentateuch as representing three distinct stages of religious development which could not be contemporaneous in origin; the identification of Deuteronomy with the period of reformation under King Josiah; the exile as the originating and formative period of the institutional life of the Jewish church; the post-exilic period when priestly predominance and the emphasis of the law became fixed, so that the law was a product of Judaism rather than its foundation; and the still later origin of some of the greatest books of the Old Testament, which “conclusion of criticism” brings the completion of that canon down to a date wellnigh overlapping the Christian era.

As denoting the gravity of the situation Prof. McFadyen specifies certain features of the Bible which seem to be put in jeopardy by the present criticism. Its credibility, for one thing. The attitude of criticism towards predictive prophecy, for another thing. Likewise the apparent indifference on the part of Old Testament critics to the explicit language of the New Testament. And a yet more distressing symptom is that in this attitude towards

the New Testament the critics manifest the same freedom, and the same independence, as respects the words of Christ himself. And then along with all these features of modern criticism, and underlying them all, is the readiness to ignore, if not to deny, the supernatural in the divine economy.

These particulars, thus indicated, may well occasion painful apprehension on the part of those who have been accustomed to acknowledge the divine character and authority of the Scriptures, and who accept them, in a real sense, as the word of God. They involve such grave and startling postulates as these: Large portions of what purports to be biblical history are not history in any honest meaning of the word, but belong to the limbo of myth and legend; while some of it is not even "idealized history," but is matter of false record. Early heroes of faith, whom the Saviour, enforcing certain of His teachings, was wont to mention as personages of the past and as still living ones in the realm of the blessed on high, had no reality whatever. Israel's development between the Exodus and the return from the exile is completely inverted. The prophets and the law, instead of "the law and the prophets," becomes the chronological order, and the law which the Apostle John declares "was given by Moses" is now attributed to unknown writers of the late Judaism of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Scripture's function of predictive prophecy is nullified, sometimes by the "literary device" of a *post-eventum* record, and sometimes by regarding the so-called prediction of the seer as merely a sagacious study and prognostication of the times. The authority of the Lord Jesus himself is called in question by the assumption that He shared the errors of His day, and that His knowledge was subject to limitations. Evolution so rules as watchword that miracles must either be summarily denied or their evidence depreciated.

The author fully realizes the wide separation in thought, in respect to the Scriptures, as occasioned by the modern critical treatment. He quotes the judgment of various writers to the effect, that this difference is immense; that peace between the two camps is impossible; that the "obsolescent treatment of the Bible" and the modern critical view are in open antagonism. While he himself has come to the new ground, it was not without a pang; and he knows how to feel for those whom, in this sense, he has left. He tells us of the confusion and sorrow that for a time came into his life when the new view of the Bible began appealing to him, and he understands the amazement and pain with which many of a tender conscience contemplate the positions now taken by criticism. For instance: "It is not an easy matter," he writes, "to accept on the first hearing the critical view of Deuteronomy as a production in the main of the seventh century B.C., published during the ministry of Jeremiah and more than a century after the time of Hosea"; and that it cannot be denied in the light of its opening words "that the common interpretation of the book as a speech delivered by Moses at the conclusion of their wanderings is the natural one." But notwithstanding the divergence of view, and notwithstanding the opinions to the contrary, as above mentioned, the Professor would fain think there is common ground sufficient on which both parties can stand, and that the gulf is not bridgeless. He would mediate between the two camps.

An examination of the grounds for the pleasing hope that is in him would be largely an examination of the entire book. This hope is based on certain conceptions he sets forth about the Bible and is valid only on the supposition of their correctness. It depends at the outset on what he understands by inspiration of the Scriptures. Generally the Professor is very lucid and direct, and the literary style of his book is charming. But we could wish for more explicitness in this part, where at times there seems to be only vagueness and a mystifying rhetoric. He avoids any definition of inspira-

tion, and contents himself with recognizing what he considers its presence. He reverently acknowledges the Bible as a divine book, and designates it as the Word of God, and a book throughout which the Spirit of God moves. Such designations, however, are not as definite and as uniform in their meaning to-day as formerly they were, and have come now to need themselves to be defined. Even Prof. Delitzsch, in his *Babel und Bibel* can speak of the spirit which animates the Hebrew Scriptures as divine. Our author emphasizes the Bible as also a word of man, and as bearing the stamp of humanity. This is clear, and certainly is important to remember. But when he says, "Perhaps we do not really appreciate the divine majesty of the Bible until we see how varied and fascinating is the humanity of it"; and when, after attributing a mythical quality to the "Hebrew stories" contained in Gen. i-xi, he yet affirms of it, "Here is the finger of God," and "Here is a section which is inspired, if the word 'inspiration' means anything at all," we feel like exclaiming as did Ezekiel's hearers, "Doth he not speak parables!" The theory of the late closing of the Old Testament canon fits in with his general view of the character of those writings. "There are no four hundred years of silence, as indeed there could not be." And one gets the impression, too, that inspired writings might be found outside the chosen nation of Israel, and that no pent-up canon may define their number. The thought that "every book within it differs in kind from every book without it" is unfortunate and "fosters bibliolatry" and a mechanical view of inspiration, and all that. The limits of the canon, however, though "theoretically open are practically closed" in the action of the Church of early days. This decision, he says, may be safely acquiesced in, although no "historical decision of that kind can be absolutely binding on subsequent generations."

From the standpoint of the human side he claims there is reason to suppose Scripture would share the imperfections and fallibility of all human things, unless God has preserved it. But has God done so? he asks; and he tells us that in the Bible we have not so much "the pure presence of the Divine Spirit, as that Spirit moving among, acting upon and blended with very human spirits." That this reveals the "conditions" under which inspiration had to work, and "what elements shall be taken up by the Spirit of God into the Bible, it is not for us to say." It would seem a postulate, the Professor writes, that "a book that is divine must be true." But this is no sooner said than difficulties begin to arise. What kind of truth? he asks; and then undertakes to show that scientifically, historically, morally and even religiously this postulate must be modified, and that the inspiration of the Bible does not guarantee the truth of its own teachings.

The critics as a whole regard the early biblical records of creation, the temptation and fall of man, the deluge, the Sodom and Gomorrah incident, etc., as legendary; the patriarchs, presented so extensively through successive generations, as in no sense personal beings but simply names or titles standing, sometimes for tribal designations, sometimes for personified virtues; the theophanies as but Oriental fancies, and all the stirring or heroic scenes, which involve in any degree a miraculous element, as the innocent folk-lore of a juvenile age. Yet it is Prof. McFadyen's thought that in respect to this the two parties can stand together by reason of a common recognition of the "religious value" embodied in these myths and fancies. They can rest on the same ground by taking them simply as moral ideas and inscribing under each, "Haec fabula docet."

Respecting the Prophets and the Psalmists, there is more force in the consideration urged by the Professor that the difference of view relative to the periods in which they wrote should not affect their value for instruction

and comfort and elevation of the soul. As regards the Prophets, however, the question of the predictive element, in Isaiah for instance, may be largely affected by the question of date, that is, "whether it be pre-exilic, exilic or post-exilic." He beautifully describes the "comfort ye" section as "the Gospel of the pity, the grace, the love of God," and claims that the religious message and its value remain the same irrespective of the time of its declaration. Not quite the same, however. There is the loss of the apologetic value which attaches to a predictive prophecy uttered a hundred and fifty years in advance, according to one view; while according to the other—with Cyrus and his conquest of Babylon just at hand—the word of comfort at the mouth of the "Second Isaiah" is based simply on a sagacious reading of the signs of the times. Of course, however, we recognize this as a legitimate question of criticism, and the matter of date in the latter portion of Isaiah cannot be determined by the fact that the accurate foresight of the distant future is of great value in the realm of Christian evidences. At the same time we cannot refrain from remarking a defect in the conception running through this whole book, which is characteristic, too, of the entire critical school of to-day. They assume that the function of Scripture must be confined to the immediate horizon, and to the directly ethical and religious, to spiritual lessons and ideas, and "things which accompany salvation." These constitute the kernel, while the setting and the circumstantial may be but as the shell and the husk. Emphasize the spiritual and essential truth as we must, yet God attached a value also to the phenomena by which very often His messages were accompanied. Hence the burning bush when He revealed His name to Moses, the lightnings and thunder when He gave the commandments, the marvels which marked the testifying work of Elijah and Elisha, and the signs and wonders attending the teachings of Jesus. To disesteem what we might consider the circumstantial would be to sit in judgment on the wisdom which put them there.

Under his view of the Bible we are not surprised to find our author showing a free hand in dealing with it. He deems it "an ungracious task to fasten attention on the difficulties of Scripture." At the same time with his plowshare running through the fields he turns up supposed difficulties in almost every furrow. He finds errors in Scripture conceptions and in its historical statements. He finds myths, legends, and imaginative embodiments in what the common reader would take as plain matter of fact narration. He finds discrepancies and contradictions in statement. In the chapter on "The Discourtesies of Criticism" he deprecates the satirical remark made by one of the "opponents" to the effect that the professional critic rejoices as "one who findeth great spoil" when he finds some new error or discrepancy in the Bible! We would be far from ascribing such spirit to Prof. McFadyen, but we confess to some surprise when we find him so complacently adopting and pressing all the chief instances of alleged difficulties in the Scripture records which have served for generations in the armories of disbelief, and this without ever once a hint or suggestion of the reconciling explanations which have over and over been made.

Another barrier between the parties has been raised by reason of their different attitudes in respect to our Lord's relation to the questions now involved in Old Testament criticism. But this wall of separation can be sensibly lowered, Prof. McFadyen assures us, when they who take alarm have come to a right understanding of the nature of Christ in the flesh and of His province as a teacher. "The critics," he says, "are contending for what they hold to be a worthier conception of Christ's person than that which the traditional theory offers them." The New Testament patently endorses "a tradition" as to Moses, but that does not bind, inas-

much as it was "no part of its function to give information on literary problems arising out of the Old Testament." Likewise Christ "held opinions" on some of these questions, but He rendered no "decisions" concerning them. Any utterances He may have made on such subjects were incidental, and out of the sphere and scope of His mission, and hence "not relevant" to the points to-day in hand. In His discourses He alluded to a great many of the incidents recorded in the Old Testament, and notably to those which are reckoned among the most marvelous, and which to-day are often heard with incredulity. "There can be practically no doubt," concedes our author, "that Christ believed in the historicity of all the incidents to which He alluded, as well as in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch." That He really held views concerning the Old Testament now current among the critics "it is abstractly possible to maintain," he says—but that is not "the natural impression made by His words, 'As it was in the days of Noah, even so shall it be,' 'Remember Lot's wife.' The power of such statements and appeals depends largely on a real conviction, on the part of speaker and hearer alike, of the historical reality of the incidents alluded to." This is strongly put. But its value as bearing on the question at issue is nullified by the Professor's suggestion, in immediate sequence, that such incidental endorsement does not necessarily stamp the incidents as historic. The fact that our Lord Himself believed all these things, and even used them in His teachings does not prove they were true. "The word became flesh"; "In the days of his flesh"; "It behooved him to be made like unto his brethren"—it is within the enfolding of these statements that he judges the Lord's avowals and declarations. Like His brethren of that day in dress and language and in the general conditions of Oriental life, why may not Christ have shared the *opinions* of His time? And as He was subject to the limitations of power, and to the bodily infirmities of hunger, thirst and weariness, why not also, to be completely man, to the human limitations of knowledge?

Very naturally, in this connection, Prof. McFadyen makes use of the one classical instance of our Lord's self-confessed limitation—that in common with men and angels He knew not the day nor the hour when the end cometh. With remarkable unanimity all the critics seize on this and press it to its utmost of application, as if to say: Ignorant on one point, unreliable on many points. There are, among others, two considerations which should be borne in mind in considering this passage:

1. While predinating nescience in one single particular, it is not an instance of mistake or error. We are not confronted by a claim of knowledge which had no foundation for it, nor an attempt at prediction which was falsified by the issue of events. This solitary statement belongs to no category which critics could ever label "The Mistakes of Jesus." It was not an instance of misjudgment, nor of fallibility, nor of narrowed horizon. Not to know must not be confounded with error, nor with liability to error. On this one question the Lord attempted no prediction and no conjecture, and thus at least He cannot be charged with making a mistake in any utterance as to the day and the hour when the end cometh. This distinction it is most important to bear in mind. Zealous theorists have pressed the declaration, which at the utmost is negative in its character and limited in its application, into the service of affirmations and postulates altogether unwarranted. When we would think of the limitations of our Lord's intelligence, we must let Him indicate for Himself, as in this exceptional restriction, the subject wherein His knowledge is limited. It is little short of impious to make His one self-acknowledged limitation a ground for assuming that He may have been ignorant, or may have been in error, on other subjects concerning which with explicitness and confidence He did

assume to speak, and over all which declarations we can throw the ægis of His own claim, "We speak that which we do know."

2. While allowing whatever legitimate restriction may be suggested by this one passage, Jesus must still be confessed, at all events and at the lowest conception, as a messenger of God to men. Even though His divinity were entirely sheathed and quiescent, and His Sonship set aside, His prophetic office would remain. At the very least He stands as a teacher equal in authority with prophets who went before Him and apostles who came after Him. Do we accept them as inspired revealers in the name of God? Did they speak as moved by the Holy Ghost, and is their work the end of controversy for those who accept the Scriptures? And shall we think to subject any of His teachings to severer tests than we would theirs? No theory of Kenosis and no inference drawn from this solitary and individual instance should be allowed for one moment to discredit or impair His teaching authority. He was the only-begotten Son, and intimately acquainted with the divine will and had the Spirit of God without measure, and was anointed above His fellows. Because Paul, referring to his wonderful vision when caught up into Paradise, said of himself "whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell" (note the resemblance to Christ's word concerning the day and the hour, "no man knoweth . . . only the Father"), we do not, therefore, think to impugn the apostle's statements on other subjects whereon he does tell us what he claims to know. If we can call them inspired and authoritative unto whom the Word of God came (and the Scriptures cannot be broken), say we of Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou art liable to error and mistake?

Our author approaches the subject of the supernatural with full realization that in respect to it modern criticism is on delicate ground. He recognizes, that "one of the heaviest counts in the indictment against criticism has been its alleged attitude" thereto; that whatever may be included under the "somewhat vague and subtle term," the supernatural represents something vital to Christianity, and "if it goes, Christianity goes with it;" and that if on *à priori* principles criticism assumes the impossibility of the supernatural, it is vitiated from the start.

In the light of such declarations it may seem ungracious to raise any question. But in the light of the whole chapter which deals with "Criticism and the Supernatural" it becomes needful to do so. Amid the amazing changes in religious thought now being seen, it is remarkable how the old terminology remains. New meanings, however, often attach to the old terms. The word supernatural to-day does not mean the same thing to all. We do not question that Prof. McFadyen for himself believes in it, in the sense of the word as commonly understood. But unless we entirely misread his book, he sets forth a conception of it, as of possible and legitimate use by those who so desire, which comes far short of the popular conception. The natural and the supernatural, he tells us, are relative terms. We know not enough of either to be able always to draw the line. What some may call the miraculous may only be the natural, and it is unjust to those who may deny the supernatural in history to suppose they therefore deny the divine in it. God is not merely in the gaps and in the events exceptional and sporadic, but is to be seen in all, and through all and over all. And they who see "everywhere throughout the universe law and the unbroken sequences of causation find in this majestic order the reflex of Him who is without variableness," and that as thus interpreted it presents a "spectacle of nobler and more mysterious majesty than would a universe whose God appeared only fitfully and in corners." This is true and beautifully uttered. But why institute the comparison? Who makes such alter-

natives? Who "sees the divine merely in the so-called supernatural," to use one of the Professor's expressions? Do they who make claim for the supernatural, in the common understanding of the word, delimit God's hand in His universe to the gaps and the corners? The remark seems utterly superfluous, unless it be understood as sanctioning (for those who so desire) a sense of the word supernatural which means not much more than a mere theistic conception of the universe, and the thought, axiomatic to the Christian believer, that God's wisdom and active superintendence are seen in all history, and that

".... through the ages an increasing purpose runs,"

and all this as opposed simply to a naturalistic hypothesis.

It is in this sense that we feel obliged to interpret his statement that "criticism does not deny the supernatural." In the same sense, too, are we to understand "the positive contribution" which, he claims, criticism offers to the supernatural. As here portrayed, the supernatural in the Old Testament is chiefly to be found in the unique development of the Jewish people, a development "due to the uniqueness of their early discipline and experience as a nation." And this not alone as pertaining to their history, but as observed also in their religion which "developed as their history advanced," and which differentiated them and maintained their separateness among the nations of the world. That the uniqueness of this strange people was an accident "no one will believe who believes that there is a purpose in history." All this is true and wellput, but the supernaturalism of the Bible is something other than the doctrine of a divine purpose in the world and the ordering of God's government in Providence.

In his laudable desire to bridge the gulf, Prof. McFadyen would have us consider whether the incompatibility between the two schools is not rather that only of standpoint, attitude and method, while essentially the Bible is held alike by both. Both, he says, take it as profitable for teaching. That while to the critics great portions of it are but myth and legend which to the others are history, yet "the religious value" of these records is the same in either case. That while also in other parts, not mythical, there are errors and inconsistencies, yet this is not to be considered as prejudicial to their inspiration. That while Christ's testimony to the Old Testament must needs be modified, in that certain parts of it were given under his limitations of knowledge, yet He can be confessed by each as the Truth. And that under some sense of the word both can hold to the supernatural. Thus can be fashioned a joint basis of union. The proposition suggests a conundrum related in one of John B. Gough's stories. A certain man, after much cogitation, propounded the question, What town in the State of New York is like the land promised of old to the children of Israel? The company unable to "guess," the answer was triumphantly revealed—"Canaan-dagua; just strike out the *daigua* and call Canaan, *Canaan*, and you have it." We fear in regard to the common platform there is too much to strike out and too much to change in what is left.

St. Louis, Mo.

MEADE C. WILLIAMS.

**ARE THE CRITICS RIGHT?** By WILHELM MÖLLER. With an Introduction by Prof. C. VON ORELLI, D.D. Translated from the German by C. H. IRWIN, M.A. New York, etc.: Fleming H. Revell Co. Pp. xxii, 215. Price, \$1, net.

Wilhelm Möller's *Historisch-Critische Bedenken gegen die Graf-Wellhausen'sche Hypothese* appeared in 1899. This book is a translation of it under a new title, and with analytical index, table of contents and marginal sub-

titles added by the translator. It is well that the translator has selected this book to give to British and American readers, and it is well that the publishers have given it so attractive an appearance. For it will do a great deal of good if it reaches the class of readers for whom it was written. There are many students of the Old Testament whose minds are preoccupied by the current critical reconstruction of Israel's history and legislation. Like the author of this book, who describes himself as a former adherent of the Wellhausen school, they have been taken captive by the apparent smoothness and simplicity of the evolutionary scheme presented as the true account of Hebrew national and institutional life. Like the author they have read nothing on the other side, or, if anything, then only specimens of that hysterical, uncritical and opprobrious ranting which by some is supposed to be sufficient to answer the critics, and which is too often referred to by the critics and their adherents as representative of the whole conservative case. Such a composition as Möller has given us is exceedingly well planned. It is not a studied defense of conservative views. It is not even a comprehensive critique of the critical position. It is simply a very clever exhibition of some of the difficulties and absurdities in which any man will find himself involved who attempts to defend the Wellhausen hypothesis, and this, too, always in the sphere of historical criticism only; dogmatic discussion is avoided. Moreover, as in Robertson's *Early Religion of Israel* (a work, by the way, to which our author owes much and frankly acknowledges his indebtedness), the debate is conducted on ground chosen by the critics themselves, granting to them all their contentions with respect to literary analysis of the sources, etc. We say, therefore, it is well planned. The plan is, likewise, happily carried out. The bulk of the book consists in a series of arguments directed against the first and most attractive claim of the critical writers, that their hypothesis alone harmonizes the legislation with the history. First, Möller shows how far Deuteronomy differs from the conditions of Josiah's reign. Next he proves the impossibility of the Priest-codex having originated in the exilic and post-exilic periods, particularly proving that Ezekiel xl-xlviii presupposes it; and, lastly, he exhibits the difficulties in the way of bringing the "Books of the Covenant" down to the eighth or ninth century. The remainder of the book is devoted to a demonstration of the impossibility of dating the Priest-codex after Deuteronomy, and of dating either of them from any other time than the Mosaic period.

The author is particularly successful in showing the unscientific and arbitrary character of the Wellhausen school in their treatment of non-observance and silence as criteria for the existence of legislation. He shows incontestably that an impartial application of the critics' own principles would bring down not only P but also D, and even the "Books of the Covenant" (Exodus xx-xxiii, xxxiv) to the period after the exile—yes, even to the time subsequent to Malachi. And the claim to favor from adherents of naturalistic evolution is shown to be a false claim by the artificial, spontaneous way in which the great "reforms" were imposed on the people from without. Thus Deuteronomy is supposed to have introduced a centralized worship at Jerusalem just when the Temple reeked with abominable idolatries. And the heretical law was put forward just when the exile had demonstrated to every one (to none more than Ezekiel) that ritual could not save Israel from the wrath of God. And for the laws of Exodus, there is not so much as a hint preserved to us of the occasion when for the first time this epoch-making legislation in the name of Moses was foisted on the people. Such books as these are needed to show to those who hesitate to accept the Bible's account of itself, because of the difficulties involved, that

there are far greater difficulties awaiting them if they deny that account and accept in its place this pseudo-scientific, arbitrary, subjective, illogical scheme.

It is regrettable that the translator has not done his work evenly and that so many errors have crept in. In only a score or so of Hebrew words in the entire book there are no less than four mistakes. Many references to chapter and verse are wrong, and not a few German words have been rendered falsely, sometimes so as to give quite a different sense from that intended by the author. Still the translation is only uneven, by no means wholly poor. For it is, above all things, a readable book, and few that take it in hand will care to lay it down until the last word is read. There is scarcely anything to which men respond more readily than to an appeal to justice in which the witnesses and the rules of evidence are adopted by the defendant from the prosecution, and turned against the prosecution to its own discomfiture.

BIBLICAL AND LITERARY ESSAYS. By the late A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. Edited by his successor, Prof. J. A. PATTERSON, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1902. Pp. ix, 320.

Dr. Davidson's position at Edinburgh made his chief labors of necessity consist of the study and teaching of the Old Testament. And it is to this department of scholarly thought that most of the thirteen essays in this memorial volume belong. Yet not all. Besides the two essays dealing with Semitic studies closely akin to his own chair, Dr. Davidson is represented in the broader outlook on general theological thought by the two essays on "The English Bible and Its Revision" and "The Rationale of a Preacher." It is a noteworthy fact, however, that even the essays on strictly Old Testament themes evidence by the breadth of their treatment the same wide outlook and sympathy. "Biblical Theology," "Modern Religion and Old Testament Immortality," and "The Uses of the Old Testament for Edification" are subjects discussed by the author in a way that peculiarly illustrates the above remark. More restricted themes, like "The Prophet Hosea," "The Prophet Amos," "The Second Psalm," "Psalm LXXII," "Psalm CX," are viewed in the light that falls on them, not only from Old Testament interpretation, but also from unrestricted theological and philosophical reflection. Dr. Davidson's standpoint is too well known to require any words of location and description. Indeed, of the thirteen essays in this volume five are only reprinted, having first been published in *The Expositor*. There is seen throughout these essays the same quality of mind as all his works exhibit, though in varying degrees, the protest of the historic sense against the logical faculty. This is a very formal and conscious protest. The critical faculty is self-conscious, and is fond of displaying itself as historical. All readers of theological literature of the present day are familiar with these self-conscious displays of criticism, with their frequent comments on how great an advance criticism has made in the most recent years. We can enjoy the plea for the historical sense, but we confess to a weariness bordering on disgust when the plea turns into a self-laudation. It always seems that a little more of that same historic sense, coupled with a larger sense of humor, would suggest to the writer the transitoriness of his present way of thinking quite as much as that of past ways, and the little advance already attained would not appear so vast if it were measured beside the changes that the future is quite as sure to bring. To us it seems an essential part of the historic sense to have a feeling for the future as well as for the past. At least, it renders the little present less self-conscious. The best thing in this collection, in our judgment, is "The Wisdom of the

Hebrews," one of the reprinted essays. That on " Mohammed and Islam " is good; that on " Arabic Poetry," still better. It is an admirable presentation of those qualities of imagination peculiar to the Semitic mind, and, written in a popular style, it is adapted to help the student of the Bible to understand much of its imagery. Here and there throughout the volume, Dr. Davidson utters his protest against the fundamental principle of the regnant school of Old Testament criticism—the absolute novelty of prophetic teaching. With the certainty of true conviction he asserts: "They (the prophets) are not innovators; they call men back to the old paths." " Their movement is retrograde. They desire to preserve for the people what they are losing. They call them back to old attainments in knowledge and sanctity; they tell them that they have 'forgotten' and 'corrupted themselves.'" Such words as these are refreshing. Yet the closing essay leaves on the mind of the reader the unpleasant impression that all the writers' opinions are in a state of flux. Speaking of the changes in men's views of the Old Testament during the past fifty years he writes: "But one who has lived during the process, and who has successively accommodated himself, step by step, to each new conclusion [?] as it arose, is not in a position to contrast the new and the old with anything like . . . sharpness. Such a person may remember his own early perplexities, and the efforts required to assimilate each new discovery, and to effect a readjustment of his mental state: but knowing that the history of his mind was the history of hundreds of other minds, and not supposing that a record of his successive mental movements would be of any use or interest to the world, he would not keep any record of them. Dr. Davidson seems to be speaking out of his own experience, and these essays, drawn from a variety of periods in his life, confirm this view. There is a great deal of truth in them, strongly grasped and beautifully expressed, yet a note of mediation on many points gives to the ear of the reader the impression of "accommodation," "assimilation" and "readjustment," the very words that he himself has used of his "successive mental movements."

Princeton.

J. OSCAR BOYD.

#### IV.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

DANIEL ERNST JABLONSKI. Von HERMANN DALTON. Berlin: Warneck, 1903. 495 pages.

Rev. Hermann Dalton, D.D., formerly pastor of the German Reformed Church of St. Petersburg, and now living in Berlin, has already put us under many obligations by his researches in, and books on, the life of John a'Lasco and the Reformed Churches of Poland and Russia. He now produces what is the best life of the great court-preacher of the Prussian court, who occupied such a unique and influential position at the end of the seventeenth century. Jablonski is a many-sided personality. As a scholar he led to the origin of the Academy of Sciences of Berlin and with Leibnitz shared its glory. But it is especially as the early advocate of church union that he is interesting to us to-day. Following in the footsteps of Bucer in the sixteenth century and of Dury in the seventeenth, his advocacy of a union of the Reformed and Lutherans in Germany proved a prophecy of the union of 1817. His efforts to bring the Anglican Church into union with the Prussian Reformed, and his remarkable position as a court-preacher of the Reformed Church and at the same time Bishop of the Moravian Church, through whom Count Zinzendorf was consecrated Bishop, make him occupy

a unique place in history. All these movements in his life are carefully delineated in detail by Dr. Dalton. The work reveals the most careful research for the original correspondence of Jablonski, and yet all is so graphically described that one forgets that it is theological history. The author combines in a wonderful degree the thoroughness of Teutonic research with the popular practical style of the Anglo-Saxon. It is a book that ought to find its way into our libraries as the great authority on the life of this important court-preacher whose efforts prophesied so much in our age.

**JOHANN CASPER LAVATER, 1741-1801.** Denkschrift zur hundersten Wiederkehr seines Todesstages. Zurich : Müller, 1902. 500 pages.

The centenary anniversary of Lavater's death gave occasion to the publication of this memorial of that genius. It consists of chapters by different Zurich historians on the different phases of Lavater's many-sided life, as Lavater in his Work and Private Life is by Finsler (the late Antistes); as a Citizen of Zurich and Switzerland by Gerold Meyer von Knonau; as a Religious Personality by G. von Schulthess-Rechberg; Lavater and Goethe by Henry Funck, and Lavater as Philosopher and Physiognomist by Henry Maier. The book is finely printed and beautifully illustrated (almost approaching an Edition de Luxe) by portraits of Lavater and his friends, Herder, Goethe and others. The chapter most interesting to us is the one on Lavater's religious views. The wonderful change of Lavater in 1779, when from being a leader of the liberals in thought in his canton he went over to becoming the leader of orthodoxy and the great opponent of rationalism, makes this subject important. This chapter throws considerable light on it from his correspondence; but the author fails to correctly describe Lavater's life, because he does not divide his life into the two parts above referred to and does not, therefore, do him justice as the great defender of Evangelical Christianity in an age when its great defenders could be counted on the fingers of one's hand. In this respect he is much more correctly described by Maier in the last chapter on Lavater as a philosopher, although the world has long ago outlived Lavater's quite interesting researches in physiognomy. But whether studied as a poet or a patriot, a preacher, philosopher or physiognomist, Lavater is deeply interesting in his unique personality. The book is a worthy tribute to a most worthy name of which Zurich may justly feel proud.

**BENEDICKT MARTI (ARETIUS).** Von ALBERT HALLER. Bern : Wyss, 1901. Neujahrsblatt herausgegeben von Historischen Verein des Kantons Bern. 1902. 55 pages.

The life of this almost forgotten Bernese theologian of the post-Reformation age is important, because the materials for his life are so few. This work reveals his great ability as a theologian and popular commentator on the Bible, and also as a scientist in astronomy and botany. His influence was important for the Reformed Churches, because he, together with Wolfgang Musculus, brought Bern into line fully with the Calvinistic doctrine, saving it from its tendency to become Lutheran. His dogmatics and commentaries were rapidly reprinted in new editions, so great was the demand for them. This brochure is a fine tribute to the wide influence and ability of this quiet professor in a small Swiss town.

**CALVIN'S JENSEITS-CHRISTENTHUM IN SEINEM VERHALTNISSE ZU DEN RELIGIOSE SCHRIFTEN DES ERASMUS.** Untersucht von MARTIN SCHULZE. Gorlitz, 1902. 74 pages.

This pamphlet is an interesting attempt to compare Calvin with Erasmus, to lay the meditations concerning the future life of Calvin's *Institutes* alongside of the religious works of Erasmus. The relations of Luther to Eras-

mus have been often discussed, especially their controversy about Determinism. But attempts to show the relation of Calvin to Erasmus and the latter's influence on the great Reformer have been rare. This work opens up, therefore, an almost entirely new field. The author says he was led to take up this subject by the fact that Calvin's earlier studies as a Humanist would naturally lead him into contact with Erasmus, which would be still further increased when Calvin published his *Institutes* at Basle, which was Erasmus's home. The author first compares their writings in the general subject of Contempt of the World and Aspiration for Death, following this with a consideration of such aspirations on morals. He then by comparisons of quotations from the works of both summarizes their religious beliefs, especially on Eschatology, proving their harmony.

GEORGE RUDOLPH ZIMMERMANN. By THEOPHIL and ARNOLD ZIMMERMANN. Zurich, 1903. 158 pages.

This pamphlet is a tribute to the memory of one of the leading ministers of Switzerland, who was the leader of the Evangelical party of his canton against the rationalists for half a century. It shows his great success and faithful testimony as pastor of one of the largest congregations in Zurich, the Fraumunster, where he was pastor for half a century. His most noted work was his *History of the Zurich Church Since the Reformation*, which gives us the best history of that interesting church that has yet been published. In it the lives of the various Antistes, who headed the Church, are given with great care and faithfulness. Any one who wishes to study the history of this first Church of the Reformation will need this work. After a life of great usefulness he passed to his reward and this work is a suitable tribute to him and his work.

LIFE OF ULRICH ZWINGLI. By SAMUEL SIMPSON. New York: Baker & Taylor Co. 279 pages.

The life of Ulrich Zwingli has been attracting more attention lately. The recent very excellent *Life* by Rev. Prof. S. M. Jackson, D.D., is now followed quickly by another work on his life by the lately elected Professor of Church History at Hartford Theological Seminary. This work has a less scholarly appearance than Jackson's, but is more popular and for that reason may gain wider circulation. Yet it is also scholarly, for it reveals considerable research: but, unlike Jackson's, does not give original Zwingli literature. Indeed, the author, in his Preface, disclaims any attempt to make it too scholarly in its appearance as by numerous footnotes. He aims to give the results of his studies rather than the method and sources. It is a well-proportioned, thoughtful statement of the life of the great Reformer. We are glad for his clear representation of several facts of importance in Zwingli's life. Thus his statements about Zwingli's relations to the Anabaptists is the clearest we have seen, and relieves Zwingli of the charges made against him for harshness against that sect. His description of the sacramental controversy with Luther and of the Marburg Conference is the most lucid and popular of any we have seen, even clearer than D'Aubigne's, who overloads his narrative with too many details. We are, however, disappointed with his treatment of the early immorality of Zwingli, for it is not as true or as happy a treatment of that difficult subject as by other biographers. It leaves the impression of Zwingli as a continuous offender and is not as well guarded as it ought to be, and has, we understand, interfered somewhat with its circulation. There are also a few verbal errors, as on page 57 where he puts Einsiedeln south of the Lake of Walenstadt, when it is south of the Lake of Zurich; and, also, the spelling of Pfeifers (page 84), which should be Pfafers; of Speier (page 184) for Spire. He also makes a misstatement (page 240) when he says that the

peace after the first Cappel war, 1529, was the first instance of religious liberty—that is, the equality of Romish and Protestant Churches was recognized. He does not seem to know, what is indeed forgotten by most Protestant historians (especially those of New England who claim Plymouth Rock as the birthplace of religious freedom), that the first illustration of religious liberty of the kind he mentions took place a few years before at Ilanz, in the caupon of the Grisons, Switzerland, June 25, 1526. We welcome this new volume on Zwingli, hoping it will aid in bringing the world to a truer estimate of Zwingli's life, which has been so much (especially in the nineteenth century, owing to the prominence of German theological thought) overshadowed by Luther; for Zwingli in some respects, as Jackson has said, is a truer and more sympathetic exponent of our age than any other of the Reformers.

ZWINGLIANA, 1903. Nos. 1 and 2. Zurich, 1903. 2 vols. 64 pages.

We call attention to these historical pamphlets, for their value is not to be measured by their size. They are among the most valuable publications on the history of the Reformed Churches. They give each year original facts and manuscripts of Zwingli. A year or two ago they published a picture of the monastery at Einsiedeln, in which was preached the first sermon of the Reformation by Zwingli in 1516—a very valuable picture, as the building was destroyed by fire in the eighteenth century. The pamphlets for this year contain a portrait and biography of Regula, Zwingli's daughter and the wife of his second successor, Gualther. A very interesting study of the polemics of the Reformation as found in the stained-glass windows of convents is added. These pamphlets are continually shedding a flood of light on many phases of the Reformer's life and times. They are published for the benefit of the fine Zwingli Museum at Zurich.

L'ACADEMIE DE CALVIN, 1559-1798. Par CHARLES BORGEAUD. Geneva : George & Co., 1900. 612 pages.

This history of the University of Geneva is an Edition de Luxe, a suitable appreciation of the long and noble history of this venerable school. It describes not merely the theological department, but also the other departments—law, literature and medicine also. As the author is professor of law, it might be expected that less would be said of theology. But he has described the various departments with great fairness, and has given special prominence to the theological department which so long was the leading one, although now eclipsed in prominence by the others. He devotes the first eighty-six pages to Calvin's work in founding the school, closing with a tribute to the greatness of his work. This he follows by giving 250 pages on Beza's leadership of the University as rector. The chapter that follows is entitled The Reign of Theology and describes the University from the days of Diodati to the younger Turretin. The last chapter is headed The Reign of Philosophy, describing the period when the theological part of the school became less prominent. These chapters are largely biographical. His sketches of the lives of the Turretins and Pictet as theologians, and Chouet among the philosophers, give a vivid insight into the internal history of the University. Indeed, without this book one is unable to understand the history of Geneva, and it is especially valuable in revealing the succession in theology in that school which went down from the Supralapsarianism of Beza to the Socinianism of Vernes. The author has no sympathy with strict Calvinism. Geneva of to-day has not a word of defense for the old Calvinism which has made Geneva what she is. Still he pays a tribute to the influence of Calvinistic theology and to the scholarship of its representatives. It contains beautiful portraits of the leading profes-

sors of the school. A valuable list of the professors and students of that period closes the volume. It is a splendid tribute to the past work of that University and in its author a tribute to its present scholarship.

**THE MINUTES AND LETTERS OF THE COETUS OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CONGREGATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA, 1747-1792.** Published by the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States. Philadelphia, 1903.

This is a very important work on the early Church history of the churches in the United States. The German Reformed Church never knew its early history exactly, as most of its early records seemed lost. They were discovered in Holland and made known to the Church by the writer, assisted by Rev. Prof. W. J. Hinke, of Ursinus Theological Seminary. This volume is the publication of that part of the Holland documents that contain the minutes of what was a sort of a syuod and was called a coetus. It occupied a place medium between a classis and a committee, not having the rights of a classis, yet having more rights than a committee. This volume throws a great flood of light on the early history of the Church. It completes the set of synod's minutes back to the very beginning. Incidentally it sheds some interesting light on the early relations between the Presbyterians and the Reformed. In addition to the Minutes of the Coetus, it contains also the annual letters sent to Holland, explaining the coetus' acts and containing a good deal of independent matter. The minutes are prefaced by three important letters of Rev. John Philip Boehm, the founder of the Church, written to Holland before the coetus was organized in 1747, containing valuable information. The volume was published by a Committee of the Eastern Syuod of the Reformed Church, and edited by Rev. Prof. W. J. Hinke and Rev. James I. Good, D.D. The volume is well printed, and has for its frontispiece a *fac-simile* of the title-page of the first coetus' minutes. It is an honor to its committee of publication and to the Church whose origin it reveals.

**HISTORY OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE.** By JOSEPH HENRY DUEBS, D.D., LL.D. Lancaster, 1903.

This volume is due to the semi-centennial celebration of the union of Marshall College, of Mercersburg, Pa., with Frauklin College, of Lancaster, in 1853. The author, however, goes back of that date and traces its history to the beginning of Franklin College in 1787. He throws a great deal of light on this very early history, and on the intimate relations of Benjamin Franklin with the institution in his efforts to elevate the Pennsylvania Germans. He proves that Franklin was present at the opening of the institution in 1787, a fact somewhat doubtful before. The most interesting part to us is the brief sketch of the early religious history of Marshall College, and of the later development of what was known as Mercersburg Theology. The book is full of new and interesting facts connected with the college. A bibliography of works by graduates of the institution closes this excellent tribute to the institution the author represents.

*Reading.*

JAMES I. GOOD.

**GESCHICHTE DER JÜDISCHEN APOLOGETIK ALS VORGESCHICHTE DES CHRISTENTHUMS.** Von M. FRIEDLÄNDER. Zürich: Verlag von Cæsar Schmidt, 1903. 8vo; pp. xv, 499.

The author of this volume has made himself favorably known by a series of interesting studies all dealing more or less directly with the connection between the Judaism of the diaspora and Christianity. The first of these, *Patristische und Talmudische Studien*, appeared as far back as 1878, and

then, after a considerable interval, the same line of investigation was further pursued in *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums, ein Excurs von der Septuaginta zum Evangelium*, 1894; *Das Judenthum in der vorchristlichen griechischen Welt, ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums*, 1897; *Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus*, 1898; *Der Antichrist in den vorchristlichen jüdischen Quellen*, 1901. The two fundamental views running through all these publications are, on the one hand, that Christianity was not only formally but materially indebted to the Judaism of the diaspora, inasmuch as some of its characteristic formative ideas were anticipated by the latter, such as that of freedom from the ceremonial law; and, on the other hand, that gnosticism existed in a well-developed form within the fold of Judaism considerable time before the rise of Christianity, indeed as far back as the time of writing of some of the Canonical Psalms, the Zedim mentioned in which are none other than gnostics. These two positions are reaffirmed with considerable emphasis in the present volume, though here they are formulated more cautiously than in the previous treatises, no doubt owing to the criticism brought against them in their original less guarded form. But these views appear here in a larger setting, since the author attempts nothing less than to give a history of Jewish Apologetics in the widest sense of the word. The apologetic attitude is according to him the very essence of the mind of the Judaism of the diaspora, since this branch of Judaism had awakened to the consciousness of the uniqueness and absoluteness and universalistic destiny of its religion, and was in the entire range of its literary production controlled by the intent to assert and defend its claims as such. To write the history of this Apologetics is to the author's view practically equivalent to writing the spiritual history of this branch of Judaism itself, since the struggle for life, as it is biologically and evolutionistically put, is the secret of the life's development. We own to having felt a certain disappointment in reading the book, because the execution hardly comes up to this magnificently, if somewhat one-sidedly, conceived programme. Friedländer's presentation of things moves too much along the line of an analysis and discussion of the single writings, and has too little of detachment on the author's part from the sources to satisfy the claims of a truly historical treatment even in a subject where so much of the historic life runs in literary channels. A further objection that may be made to the book is that it forces into the category of Apologetics practically the whole extra-canonical literature of Judaism belonging to the period dealt with. While in a case like that of the Sibylline writings and the works of Josephus and the older quasi-historical productions this is the true point of view, it is hardly correct to apply this to the Apocalyptic literature, as the author attempts to do. Here certainly the apologetic motive was entirely secondary, and to place it in the foreground necessarily results in giving a distorted view of the character and aims of this class of writings. With reference to the influence of the freer tendencies of the diaspora-Judaism upon the Christian religion, two things might be said. On the one hand, Friedländer still overestimates the extent to which emancipation from the literal observance of the Mosaic law had been carried among the Jews in Egypt and elsewhere. Though it cannot be denied that an antinomian party existed, there is no ground to believe that it was in any sense influential. It has been correctly observed that even a man like Philo, who goes so far in his allegorizing, spiritualizing evaporation of the intent of the Mosaic law, still firmly insists upon the observance of the letter as of coördinate importance with the apprehension of the spirit. On the other hand, the author does not make clear how he conceives in the concrete of the channel through which this law-free spirit affected the origin of Christianity. Some

of his statements read as if he considered the latter a direct product of the former. But he has not shown that Jesus was or could have been subject to any influence from this quarter. After all that has been said, it still is true that Christianity is the creation of Christ, so that, unless Christ can be brought into vital connection with the ideas or spirit of the diaspora, this hypothesis lacks all support. If on the other hand, the influence of this factor is found at a later stage of the history of primitive Christianity, say in Stephen or Paul, then this involves the admission that at the utmost it can come under consideration as a secondary factor, since at any rate the main impulse toward emancipation from the law must have come to them from Jesus, if the history of early Christianity is to possess any true continuity at all. Apart from this, the author seems to us to overlook the immense difference between the most enlightened and emancipated diaspora-Judaism and Christianity from a soteriological point of view. The soteriological principle is almost entirely absent from this type of Judaism. In Christianity it is central from the beginning, as may be seen from this that the standpoint of freedom from the law is, most clearly in Paul, reached through a soteriological process. Not in the negative feature which they have in common, but in the positive principle which in each case underlies and explains the negation consists the essence of Judaism and Christianity respectively.

It is a decided merit of the author that he has once more called attention to the presence of a gnosticizing element in *præ*-Christian Judaism. Undoubtedly he goes too far in interpreting everything said about the Minim of these Jewish gnostics, in finding them everywhere, where any radical form of opposition to orthodox Judaism is spoken of, as, *e.g.*, in the Zedim of the Psalms, and in explaining from this gnostic movement in Judaism the development of the idea of the antichrist. Nevertheless, even in the reduced sense in which Friedländer's theory will have to be taken in order to stand, it is of far-reaching importance for the problem of the gnostic views attacked in some of the New Testament writings, especially certain Pauline Epistles. If the author's theory can be substantiated in any degree at all, the polemic against gnosticizing views can no longer be considered a mark of post-Apostolic origin.

The entire question of explaining Christianity as a specific form of the development undergone by Judaism in the diaspora has been moved one stage farther back by the most recent Babylonian mythologizing hypothesis as applied to important New Testament ideas and institutions by Bousset, Gunkel and others. According to their view, it is the Judaism of the diaspora itself which requires an explanation, and which, the more it is investigated, the more assumes the character of a syncretistic religion not capable of direct derivation from the religion of the Old Testament. Nay, on this most recent view it would seem as plausible to say that Christianity did receive the elements in question directly from the Oriental systems as that it received them meditately through its descent from Judaism.

In regard to the chronology of the literature involved, it is interesting to compare the views of Friedländer with those of Schürer on the one hand and of Bousset on the other hand. Friedländer puts Aristeas 200 B.C. "at the latest;" Bousset, his pseudo-Aristeas between 40 B.C. and 30 A.D. Similarly Aristobulus is assigned by our author to the early time of 170-150 B.C., by Bousset to the Roman period. The Sapientia Salomonis is dated from the middle of the second century B.C., whereas Bousset brings this also down to the time shortly before or after Christ. Baruch is believed to have been written "soon after the destruction of the temple," and IV Ezra is made dependent on it, to both of which positions Bousset takes exception. Only

with reference to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Bousset stands for the earlier date in making the *Grundschrift Maccabean* in its time of composition. In most of these points Friedländer adheres to the older views as represented by Schürer, and refuses to accept the newer chronology of the Judaistic literature advocated by Willrich and others.

Princeton.

GEERIARDUS VOS.

BAPTISM AND CHRISTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY. By CLEMENT F. ROGERS, M.A. An Offprint of *Studio Biblica et Ecclesiastica* (Vol. V, part IV, pp. 239-361). With 64 illustrations. Oxford : At the Clarendon Press, 1903. 8vo, pp. 122. 5 shillings, net.

In this careful investigation Mr. Rogers has done a delicate and much-needed piece of work, and he has done it well. The precise subject he has investigated is the mode of baptism practiced in the early Church, as it has left traces of itself upon the monuments. This subject, of course, has not lain up to now wholly unstudied. The somewhat cognate subject of the baptism of Christ as depicted in the monuments has been, indeed, repeatedly studied,—most authoritatively, perhaps, for a portion of the field, by A. de Waal, in a paper in the *Römische Quartalschrift* for 1896; most comprehensively in a treatise by Dr. Josef Strzygowski, published in 1885. And Mr. Rogers' precise subject has been recently dealt with, among others, by Dr. Philip Schaff in a section of his *Oldest Church Manual*, and by Dr. C. W. Bennett in his *Christian Archaeology*, as well as, perhaps most fully of all, by the writer of this notice, in a paper published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1896. It is naturally a great pleasure to us to note that in the matter of chief concern—the determination of the mode of baptism actually practiced in the early Church—Mr. Rogers announces conclusions not essentially different from those which we ourselves reached: and, we may add, these conclusions are supported also by the great names of De Rossi and Duchesne, and, most recently, Wilpert. And it is a matter of no less pleasure to us to see these conclusions based by Mr. Rogers on a more complete survey of the material than it was open to us to make.

The characteristic feature of Mr. Rogers' book is that it brings together and places before the reader the entire series of monuments, preserved from the early Church, which depict the act of baptism. These monuments have, moreover, been studied by Mr. Rogers critically, and are reproduced by him from the best sources. Although, we must confess, they are not very artistically reproduced, they come before us in his pages, nevertheless, in their most authoritative presentation. As the reader turns over these pages, there passes in review before him the entire testimony as to the usage of the early Church which is at the moment accessible, and he can form his own conclusions from it. Mr. Rogers accompanies the presentation of the evidence with a running comment: and sums up his conclusions from it from time to time with clearness and force. But this is done in a manner which seems rather to offer the reader aid in estimating the bearing of the evidence than to obtrude another's opinions upon him. The book is distinctly an investigation and its conclusions stand out merely as the suggested results of the investigation.

We are not going so far to forego the prerogatives of a critic as to find no fault with Mr. Rogers at all. We think it a pity that Mr. Rogers does not separate the monuments which deal with the historical scene of our Lord's baptism from those which depict the customary rite of Christians. The conclusion ultimately attained would, it is true, have been the same: but the pathway over which we travel to reach it would have been a trifle more clearly blazed out. We think further that Mr. Rogers errs in setting

aside the literary evidence with such decision. It is true enough, as he remarks, that the writings of the Fathers preserved to our time are only a small part of the literature of their day, are no doubt the best part of it, and just because the best part of it "tend to depict the ideal in their minds rather than to chronicle the actual that lay before their eyes" (p. 240). But this is far too facile a method of dealing with a body of testimony which stands oddly athwart that of the monuments. It must surely be reckoned with rather than neglected; and if it is not to be permitted to set wholly aside the testimony of the monuments it must nevertheless to some extent modify our conclusions from that testimony. Still, again, we think Mr. Rogers does not sufficiently allow for the strictly local character of the earlier monumental evidence. He does, indeed, at the outset, clearly recognize the fact that it is local: "direct evidence as to the custom of the ante-Nicene Church," he says (p. 239), "is confined to the paintings of the catacombs of Rome." And it is to be remembered that later the evidence grows broader in its provenience; and that there is some early indirect evidence from other quarters of the Church. Nevertheless, it appears to us that Mr. Rogers does not sufficiently consider the bearing of the fact that the evidence belongs to so confined a locality. Finally, it seems to us that Mr. Rogers shows more insight in marshalling the evidence than he exhibits historical imagination in constructing the development of the usages whose evolution he is investigating. We are not always sure that the sequences of events are vitally conceived by him, and we sometimes feel that the evidence is a shade mechanically applied.

These are all minor faults of procedure in an undertaking like Mr. Rogers', who is rather presenting the evidence clearly and fully than writing the history of the usages; and they have little effect upon the value of his hook. But it is a strong case that is not somewhat affected by even minor faults in its presentation. Accordingly, although there is left no room to doubt that Mr. Rogers has drawn in the main the right conclusion from the evidence, there are elements in his statement of the conclusion to which he is driven by it that do not strike the reader as inevitable. His main conclusion is, as we have said, that of De Rossi and that of Duchesne, viz.:—that primitive Christian baptism was normally administered to recipients, standing in a greater or less depth of water, by pouring water upon their heads and so over their persons. That this was the usage in Rome it seems impossible to doubt. That the same usage obtained over the rest of the Church, there is not so great a body of evidence to demonstrate; but there is sufficient to make it highly probable. But that baptism was never administered otherwise in the early Church—for example, by sinking the head beneath the water—is not clear. And that the normal method of baptism to standing recipients was not itself considered a form of "immersion," and that we may speak of early baptism shortly as having been by "affusion" and undertake to point out when "immersion" was first introduced and by what chain of circumstances it was brought in, is still less clear. It seems to be altogether probable that baptism in the early Church was looked upon as a complete bath: and that, although in cases of necessity—whether on account of illness in the recipient or on account of scarcity of water—the actual bath was symbolized rather than enacted (on the principle laid down in John xiii. 10), yet in all normal cases it was more or less fully enacted. That it was ordinarily enacted by pouring the water over the person as the recipient stood in the font, rather than by sinking the person beneath the water, should in all the circumstances have seemed *a priori* most likely, and appears to be rendered highly probable for a large part of the Church at all events by the monumental evidence. But this rite can no more be called "af-

fusion" than "immersion": it combined in it elements of both, and was, in principle, all that "immersion" is. The "immersion" of the modern East is as truly rooted in it, therefore, as the "aspersion" of the modern West: each is the product of a true development, although in opposite directions, and each reproduces a feature in early baptism which in those days only exceptionally occurred separately, but doubtless never was without example in the Church.

Let us give, however, a more exact account of Mr. Rogers' own conclusions. For the earliest age he sums up the evidence as follows: "To conclude, the direct evidence from archaeology alone may not be conclusive to show that in the pre-Constantinian times baptism by affusion only was practiced generally or, indeed, in any single case: but it does show, that there was nothing repugnant to it to the general mind; that no stress was laid on total immersion; that the most important moments were held to be those when water was poured over the catechumen, and when the minister laid his hand on his head. This, taken in connection with the known customs of later ages, makes it more than probable that the usual method of administration was by affusion only" (pp. 257-8). For the next age, the following is his summary: "In the fourth and fifth centuries baptism took place before a witness or witnesses, in a fixed spot, either in a structural baptistery, into which the water usually fell from a spout or figure-head, or in a movable basin. In the latter case the officiant poured water over the catechumen from a vessel; in the former he led him under one of the spouts, and either directed the flow over his head with the vessel or guided his head under the water with his hands. This we know from other sources was done three times. . . . The officiant seems to have stood on a raised platform or step and not to have entered the water himself" (p. 274).

So far the evidence is all Western. After the fifth century, a certain amount of evidence is derived from other parts of the Church; and while in the main the evidence from this period is of the same significance as that from the earlier times, yet there seems to be a tendency observable in it to more marked realism in depicting the historical scene of our Lord's baptism, and this somewhat confuses the impression received from the series as a whole. Mr. Rogers' summary for this period (p. 300) is, therefore, somewhat less clear than for the earlier periods: he notes particularly a tendency to increase the depth of the water in which the recipient stands. As a matter of fact only three of the instances adduced (Nos. 48, 49, 54) clearly depict ordinary baptism: all the rest are representations of the baptism of Christ. In one of the three instances of ordinary baptism (No. 48), a German representation of the ninth century, the recipient stands in a narrow hogshead-like font, from which he protrudes from the waist upward, while the baptism is completed by suffusing the head with water raised in the officiant's hand. Another (No. 54), also a German example, is of the same type. The third (No. 49), from Grado, assigned to the sixth or seventh century, depicts the recipients as standing in water up to their shoulders, out of doors, doubtless in a stream, while the hand of the officiant rests on the head of one of them, which it may be he is about to submerge. "If the date be correct," remarks Mr. Rogers, "this is the earliest representation of baptism in which submersion could be intended" (p. 296). Otherwise, he finds the first traces of submersion in the ninth century (pp. 301, 303). Summing up the total positive evidence from archaeology (p. 303), derived from the survey of sixty examples from a widely extended region, he concludes, therefore, that "the type is persistent and lasts with little real alteration from the earliest times till it hands on the traditional form to mediæval art. . . . As far as there is any development

in the actual mode of administration it is toward submersion, but the furthest step in that direction consists in representing the water as rising (in most cases miraculously) as high as the neck." This "persistent type," he repeats (p. 304), is that of a rite completed "by pouring water over the candidate's head by the bishop, or guiding his head under a descending stream."

One of the most interesting portions of Mr. Rogers' discussion is the detailed study he gives of the fonts of early Christian times. This he offers as a sort of supplementary investigation into the possibilities of baptism by immersion. He has apparently passed in review nearly all known examples of fonts in all parts of the Church, and his conclusion from their study is very precise. "In none of these cases would submersion be easy or natural; in most cases it would be impossible." "Such a remarkable unanimity in spite of differences in details," he remarks further, "points back to a much earlier original type of basin which certainly would not have been large; and if we are right in holding that the private bath in domestic use was the model which first suggested the form and shape of the later structures, we may confidently assert that baptism by submersion would be as difficult to carry out in them as it would have been in the catacombs" (p. 354). There is no more valuable portion of the volume than this thorough study of the early fonts, unless it be the short note on pp. 267 sq., on the "use of a patera in baptism." The patera occurs in a representation of the baptism of Christ on a sarcophagus in the Lateran (No. 17), as well as in the great Mosaic in the Orthodox Baptistry at Ravenna (No. 26). Strzygowski tells us that this portion of the sarcophagus is a restoration, and supposes the same to be true of the Mosaic at Ravenna, chiefly on the ground that such a use of the patera is not known in liturgical use until the fourteenth century. Mr. Rogers replies by pointing to its appearance on the well-known spoon from Aquileia (No. 24), which belongs to the fourth or fifth century, and by the adduction of actual patereæ, apparently, from their ornamentation, used for baptism, which belong certainly to the ninth century and possibly even to the fourth and fifth (pp. 268-269). He adds a representation from the ninth century (No. 25) in which "a similar vessel" is used. In the presence of these facts there exists no reason for doubting that the water was raised over the head of the recipient from an early day by means of a vessel, as well as by the naked hand. For that it was water (and not oil, as some have contended) that was poured from these patereæ is clear both from the representations and from the patereæ themselves.

It will be observed that it is part of Mr. Rogers' contention that "immersion," in the sense of *submersion*, was unknown to the early Church, in practice, however much the language of the Fathers seems to suggest it. "As a matter of fact," he says in his final summary of the whole evidence (p. 357), "we have seen that whatever may have been the theories of ecclesiastical writers on the subject, the evidence from archæology shows that they had little or no influence on popular practice for at least seven hundred years, and it is only when in the West Latin ceased to be the language which people habitually thought, and when in the East the growing rarity of adult baptism made the Greek word *patient* of an interpretation that suited that of infants only, that the more literal meaning of the term began to be enforced." The first monumental representation capable of being interpreted as submersion, as we have seen, is commonly assigned to the sixth or seventh century (No. 49), while the first clear instances come from the ninth century (pp. 303-4). Similarly, the earliest Conciliar order requiring immersion belongs to the ninth century (p. 301, the Council of Chelsea, canon 11). In accordance with these facts Mr. Rogers proposes to

read the well-known passages in Walafrid Strabo and others, culminating in Thomas Aquinas, as marking the gradual introduction of the practice of immersion, instead of, as it has been usual to understand them, as marking the gradual introduction of the practice of simple affusion (pp. 301, 302). He supposes, therefore, that in the West "immersion" began to be insisted on in the ninth century and had become universal in the thirteenth. How or when it gave way once more to simple affusion he does not attempt to trace, beyond remarking that "the mediæval custom of dipping has ceased to be practiced in the West, except by the English Baptist community," since the sixteenth century. From this we should presume his historical construction would be: Complete affusion solely until the ninth century; mixed usage until the thirteenth; immersion solely until the sixteenth; simple affusion solely from that time on. So complicated a scheme of historical evolution requires some detailed evidence to support it, and perhaps Mr. Rogers may at some future time extend his archæological researches through the middle and modern ages for this purpose. Meanwhile, we may be forgiven if we think a simpler scheme more likely. For the East, he supposes that "the modern Greek custom of dipping probably became universal . . . between the ninth and eleventh centuries, at the time when Byzantine art became stereotyped and so strongly marked by liturgical custom, and when original thought also gave way to rigid traditionalism." "The Armenian Church," he continues, "similarly adopted it, but retained the more primitive affusion side by side with the more recent practice." This is simpler: and is very likely a true account of the case. Perhaps the simplest broad generalization would be to say that the primitive form of baptism was a complete bath, ordinarily performed by pouring water upon a recipient standing in a greater or less depth of water; that from the ninth century on this tended to harden into a submersion, which became universal in the East, but in the West failed to supplant the more commodious method which gradually became rather a simple affusion. The monumental evidence seems to suggest such a generalization; and it seems to afford a ready account of the historical notices.

We must not pass from Mr. Rogers' volume in a vein of criticism. Its primary purpose is not to work out a scheme of historical evolution for the mode of baptism: but to present and estimate the archæological evidence for the early mode of baptism. This its primary purpose it fulfills with thoroughness and critical skill. Every student of the subject will go to it as providing the most convenient and trustworthy presentation of the whole evidence accessible. The work will need to be done over again only when the increasing accumulations of archæological research provide additional materials in such amount as to justify a new attempt to collect and classify and estimate them. Meanwhile, it must be allowed that a sufficient body of material is already brought before us in this volume to place the main conclusion suggested by it, and drawn out by Mr. Rogers, beyond the likelihood of any very great need of revision.

*Princeton.*

B. B. WARFIELD.

## V.—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

DAS WESEN DES CHRISTENTHUMS. Vortrag, gehalten vor der zehnten Delegatensynode (1902) der Synode von Missouri, Ohio u. a. Staaten. Von F. PEEPER. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1903. 8vo, pp. 16.

UEBER DAS WESEN DES CHRISTENTHUMS und seine modernen Darstel-

lungen. Zwei Vorträge gehalten auf der sechsten theologischen Lehrkonferenz in Mölln in L. von D. ERICH SCHÄEDER, Professor der Theologie in Kiel. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1904. 12mo, pp. 78.

Echoes of the explosion produced by Harnack's great assault on the essence of Christianity are still sounding around us, whereof these two pamphlets are witnesses. Prof. Pieper's lecture is a ringing declaration along lines so far one with Cremer's, that "the essence of Christianity consists in faith in Christ, not in man's own morality: and that the Christian Church must hold fast to this essence of Christianity, if it is to fulfill its task in the world." For only by so doing can it bring to man "(1) salvation, (2) assurance of God's grace, (3) diligence in good works, (4) spiritual understanding." "May God in His grace preserve us for Christ's sake in the truth of His Gospel!" That is Prof. Pieper's closing prayer, in which we heartily join with him.

Prof. Schaeder's lectures are of a different order. In the first he undertakes to determine the exact state of the controversy that has raged around Harnack's book. In the second he essays to vindicate the truth of Paul's Christianity against Harnack's strictures. The poles of the controversy he finds in Harnack (with whom he classes Seeberg for all that enters into the substance of the question) and Cremer; and he very interestingly develops the exact contention of each. It is not adequate, he thinks, to identify Harnack with the old rationalism and the notion that man is self-saved; or Cremer with the contention that salvation is heterosoteric. There are shades of meaning in each that must be attended to; and these are interestingly drawn out—ending in so fine a distinction as this: that according to Harnack Christianity is a vague and mystical thing, according to Cremer a real, spiritual and moral thing: according to Harnack Christ was a man who felt the love of God as no one felt it before Him and so became the first example of the Christian religion, according to Cremer He is the God-man who humbled himself to become flesh and make satisfaction for the sins of the world: according to Harnack Christianity is the culmination of the religio-moral development of the world, according to Cremer it is the intrusion of God into the development of the world rushing to destruction, and the saving of that world to God: according to Harnack Christianity is faith in God and experience of His power mediated through Christ by means of the powerful impression made by His Godly life, according to Cremer it is faith in the crucified and risen Christ but in that very act faith also in the gracious God and possession of God.

Prof. Schaeder's second lecture is devoted to justifying the Church of the Reformation in looking to Paul for its Christianity. According to Harnack Paul's Christianity is a transformation of the real, that is, of original Christianity. In the Christianity of Jesus there stood no obstacle between the soul and the love of God, needing to be removed by an objective atonement; while in Paul's Christianity the need of an atonement for sin takes the central place. We cannot here go into Prof. Schaeder's discussion, in the course of which he passes under review a number of the replies that have been made to Harnack. Suffice it to say that he works out a very interesting vindication of Paul's Christianity as the only true Christianity—the Christianity not of Paul only but of Jesus Himself and all His followers. For the matter itself here discussed and the right lines of its solution our readers will be prepared by remembrance of Dr. Geerhardus Vos's paper on *The Alleged Legalism in Paul's Doctrine of Justification*, published in the number of this REVIEW for April, 1903 (pp. 161 sq.).

**THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.** Outline Notes based on Luthardt and Krauth. By REVERE FRANKLIN WEIDNER, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, etc. Chicago, New York and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1903. Svo, pp. 120.

In this volume Dr. Weidner makes one more step towards the completion of his gigantic task of supplying his pupils with a complete handbook of theological science. Of the portion of this text book which is devoted to Dogmatic Theology, he has already published *An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (2d ed., 1895) and *Theologia: or The Doctrine of God* (1903). "Six great divisions of Dogmatics," he remarks, are still left, viz. (in his nomenclature): Anthropologia, Christologia, Soteriologia, Pneumatologia, Ecclesiologia, and Eschatologia. In the volume before us a beginning is made with the fifth of these, Ecclesiologia. Six divisions are marked off for this topic, viz.: "(1) The Doctrine of the Church, (2) The Doctrine of Holy Scripture (Inspiration), (3) The Word of God as a Means of Grace, (4) The Sacrament of Baptism, (5) The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and (6) The Doctrine of the Christian Ministry." We shall not pretend to think that this conception of the contents of the topic "Ecclesiologia" is just or this ordering of the topics, supposing they all belong under this head, is logical: but we shall not stop now for criticism. The present volume takes up only (Dr. Weidner says, "mainly") the first of these subheads, viz.: "The Doctrine of the Church." The method is that with which we have become familiar from the former volumes of the series: the subjects treated are developed by means of a succession of brief, sharply stated, numbered paragraphs—the filling up with details being left to the reader himself. In the working out of the subject the Scripture Doctrine is first taken up, and then the history of the doctrine, while finally the thetical construction is made.

Dr. Weidner writes, of course, as a Lutheran and from a distinctively Lutheran point of view. He is a shade more polemically Lutheran, and a Lutheran of his particular variety, we think, than there was need of his being. He does not always seem to apprehend the Reformed positions exactly and is therefore not infrequently—unconsciously we are sure—unfair to them. The book will nevertheless be useful to all who wish to see in brief space a comprehensive sketch of the various opinions that have been held as to the nature, organization and government of the Church.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

**HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.** By HENRY C. GRAVES, D.D. President of the Boston Evangelical Institute. Prepared for the classroom and the use of students. This work is based upon the *Manual of Christian Theology*, by Alvah Hovey, D.D., LL.D., with the special permission and approval of the author. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1903. 12mo, pp. xi, 176.

This little handbook is particularly interesting as an example of the teaching in Christian doctrine given in the "Evangelical Institutes" and similar primary schools of religious knowledge, which are becoming so common nowadays. This teaching is intended for (as Dr. Graves expresses it) "beginners in the synthetic studies of biblical truth," and seekers for "substance of doctrine that may be believed." The temptation is strong in such circumstances, not merely to simplify the statement of the truth that it may be better apprehended by "beginners," but also to dilute the substance of the truth that it may be found more easy to believe by seekers for "substance of doctrine that may be believed." It is reassuring to find that

Dr. Graves measurably resists this temptation. When the matter to be taught is a Baptist *peculum*, to do him justice, we must confess he resists it altogether. He is quite sure, for example, that that only those who already believe are to be baptized, and that they are to be baptized by immersion, are theologoumena which will be very readily assimilated by "beginners in the synthetic studies of biblical truth" and "seekers for substance of doctrine that may be believed." On other items he seems to be more doubtful and appears sometimes to avoid clear-cut statements; at least he seems unwilling to commit himself to the clear-cut statements which have already been beaten out in controversy, and prone to suggest others in their place which do not appear so easy to be believed, at least by those who are not "beginners in the synthetic studies of biblical truth." As an example, after enumerating and criticising the six chief theories of the relation of man to Adam's sin, he adds: "The biblical doctrine we believe to be that every child of Adam is accountable"—for what? "For the sympathy he has with the evil in the world, and with the primal act of disobedience." We consider that a masterpiece of non-commitment: especially when read in connection with its subsequent context. Again, after discussing the various theories of the humiliation of Christ, he adds: "Without advocating any human theory we may adopt the following statement"—which leaves us in doubt whether "the following statement" is to be thought of as a superhuman or an inhuman theory. That we may not do Dr. Graves' book a serious injustice we must hasten to add that the fault we have been adverting to is more a fault of manner than of substance. No great power of exact statement is manifested and a certain vagueness results which is certainly very undesirable in a compend: but in the main the positions taken commend themselves as not injudicious and in intention evangelical. If only he was as sure-footed in treading the evangelical pathway as in treading that marked out by his Baptist heritage, he would make an excellent handbook.

*Princeton.*

B. B. WARFIELD.

## VI.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

THE HISTORY AND USE OF HYMNS AND HYMN-TUNES. By the Rev. DAVID R. BREED, D.D., Professor in the Western Theological Seminary. Fleming H. Revell Company, MCMIII. 8vo; pp. ix, 364.

This volume is confessedly the outgrowth of the needs of a teacher of practical theology; and, in preparing it, its author brings to his task the rich experience of a successful pastor. It is at once a brief history of hymnology and a very helpful discussion of the whole subject. The scope of the book is comprehensive—too comprehensive for a full presentation of it in detail, but not too comprehensive to set forth a perspective of hymnology such as one can find, within the same limits, almost nowhere else. After a glance first at Hebrew hymns and then at the Greek and Latin hymns of the early Church, Dr. Breed discusses the hymns of Germany, especially those of Luther. Here is a vast field in itself; for German evangelical writers have produced over 80,000 hymns, the great mass of which, of course, were born only to die unsung. He divides English hymnology into three periods: the Doctrinal and Didactic, 1650 to 1780; the Missionary and Evangelistic, 1780 to 1850; and the Experimental and Devotional, from 1850 to the present. Concerning the last, we are interested in the observation, that there is a decadence in hymnody; that this is due to lack of fresh impulse; and that women are displacing men as the chief singers.

We are told that the final arbiter in judging of the excellence of a hymn is Christian usage; even so, it must yet conform to certain conditions. Its adoption must not be merely local or sectarian, it must be permanent; the hymn must be suitable for purposes of worship; and it must have been sanctioned by some recognized organization of Christians. There follows an exceedingly interesting discussion of the "votes" of the hymnals and hymnologists as to the rank of the great hymns. Both the agreements and disagreements presented by these "votes" are suggestive. Beyond all this, Dr. Breed insists for himself that standard hymns must be scriptural in sentiment and expression, they must be devotional and they must be lyrical. He gives us his own judgment that the finest hymn in the English language is Watts' "When I survey the wondrous cross," its place being disputed, as he thinks, only by Toplady's "Rock of Ages." He concedes, however, that many reserve the first place for Wesley's "Jesus, Lover of my Soul." In such a discussion, the personal preference is bound to be determined by variable considerations, and the old proverb is particularly applicable that in matters of taste there can be no definite common standard. For example, Dr. Breed rauks low John Henry Newman's "Lead, kindly light." "It can scarcely be called either a great poem or a great hymn, and it certainly is not a great lyric. The rhythm is so very rough and confused that it is never sung successfully by a number of persons" (p. 207). And yet Hezekiah Butterworth, in *The Story of the Hymns*, (p. 215) calls this "one of the sweetest and most trustful of modern hymns," and Dr. Louis F. Benson, who is no mean critic, deems "this much-loved hymn" worthy of an extended notice in his *Studies of Familiar Hymns* (pp. 85-96). The Church has seized this poem, which was not written by a Roman Catholic but by a Protestant, for Mr. Newman had not yet gone over to Rome, and has made it her own. It may be true that it was not designed as a hymn by its author; but if Dr. Breed will allow Christian usage to determine the rank of a hymn, then certainly this hymn has good claims to a high rank.

There are some omissions from Dr. Breed's list at which we wonder. For example, why is it that the hymnologists have nothing to say of Samuel Stennett's "Majestic sweetness sits enthroned"? His name does not appear in this volume and yet we regard this as one of the great hymns, even by Dr. Breed's own indisputable standards of judgment. Of course, out of the 400,000 hymns which have been written, with only about 400 of them in common use and only 150 accorded first rank, it would be strange indeed if there should be anything else than the most general consensus concerning hundreds of those ranking high above the average.

The second part of the book discusses Tuues. Here, too, we are told that three periods are covered: from the earliest times to Hucbald, 930; thence to Palestrina, who is represented as bearing the same relation to Reformed music that Luther bears to the Reformed faith, 1563; and thence till now. A somewhat technical description follows of the development of sacred music from the homophonic era, of the "tetrachord of Olympus," of polyphony and the counterpoint. As a hymn is in a sense an autobiography of its writer, so a hymn-tune is a symptom and product of the age which contributes it. "Its harmony, its intellectuality, its popular uses, and its sacred character all have the most profound meaning. They speak of awakening mind, of larger brotherhood, of the sovereignty of the people, and of vital religion. Its appearance must be also explained in connection with hymnody, for here is wedlock of the most positive kind. The hymn and the hymn-tune are a substantial unity. The one without the other has a barren existence, is but half a self, and perishes in its unproductiveness" (p. 288). The best tunes, like the best hymns, must be determined by Christian usage, and this will be ascertained by referring to intelligently and

responsibly compiled hymnals. Here Dr. Breed says many good things, some of which, as he must know, are sure to be stoutly contested. He is bolder than most in defending the coupling of new tunes with hymns to which old tunes have long been wedded. But, whatever the critics may say, we prefer *Coronation* for "All hail the power of Jesus' name," and we believe we have the people with us in this. *Lux Benigna* is so wedded to "Lead, kindly Light" that either *Lux Beata* or *Sandon*, good as they may be in themselves, seem to us little better than unwelcome intruders. One of the best parts of this book is the discussion of "Gospel Songs." Dr. Breed puts into italics his conviction that "*they are not hymns.*" There may be hymns among them, as, e.g., Mrs. Hawks' "I need thee every hour" and Fannie Crosby's "Jesus keep me near the cross"; but he will not apply the term to such productions as "Hold the fort," "There were ninety and nine," and "What shall the harvest be?" These and their kind may be beautiful sacred songs, but hymns they are not, says Dr. Breed. The ultimate object contemplated in a hymn is God, so co-ordinating with prayer; in a song, it is the hearer, so co-ordinating with exhortation. This discrimination is both acute and accurate, and it is owing to its having been largely overlooked that there has been such a sad degradation of hymnology in the modern Church. Dr. Breed strongly and justly protests against the dissociation of old standard hymns from the stately tunes to which the Church has been accustomed to sing them. It is little less than a sin to connect them with light and trifling melodies. Altogether, the treatment of this important subject is bold, strong and eminently sane.

We are interested in Dr. Breed's conception of the proper order of precedence in public worship. Presbyterians are usually understood as giving the first place in importance to the sermon, sometimes in theory, generally in practice. This is Dr. Breed's order: the Reading of the Scriptures; Sacred Song; Prayer; the Sermon. This volume is admirably suited to be of service to pastors, not because the author is always entirely correct or above criticism in his views, but because he is always sound in the principles which he lays down, he is always fresh and suggestive and intelligent in his positions, and he presents the subject in such a way as to put the rich resources in which it abounds at the service of the pastor, both in preaching the Gospel and in dealing with one of the most important and not unfrequently one of the most delicate and difficult parts of his many-sided work.

In two places in the book we are puzzled to know what Dr. Breed means, and are disposed to conclude that there has been a little carelessness in proof-reading. On page 61, we read concerning Rous' Version these words: "Its close adherence to the original text, however, was inseparable from that grace of English diction which is so large a part of *tic merit.*" This is confusing, but the next sentence increases the confusion: "It cannot be reconciled with the best modern taste, and many illustrations might be given of its defects if it were necessary." On page 83, in the discussion of the conditions to which a hymn must conform before it can be said to be adopted, we read, "If it never emerges from the publication of some irresponsible person or firm, it cannot be called 'adopted'". Legion have been the productions which have emerged from irresponsible persons and firms and they have been "adopted" in a way, but Dr. Breed is far from teaching that they are therefore among the standard hymns of the Christian Church.

Trenton.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

**SUNRISE ADDRESSES FROM A CITY PULPIT.** By the Rev. G. H. MORRISON, M.A., Glasgow. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1903. 8vo; pp. xi, 310.

"There was never a time in which the sense of mystery was less presen-

than to-day." "It has ever been a mark of Christianity that it kept men alive to the mysteries about them." These sentences indicate the motive and the message of this volume. Mr. Morrison is a poet-preacher: not in the sense that, finding a motive somewhere, perhaps in the Scriptures, he spins a homily out of his own consciousness; but in the sense in which all true preachers, and especially Christ Himself, have been poets, he looks beneath the surface of things, seeking to discover the differences between the outer and the inner life and to show the relation between them. Mystery is a keyword to his preaching—the mystery of nature, of life, of love, of God in nature and life, and of Christ unfolding mysteries, and at the same time bringing to our consciousness the deeper mysteries that are in the Father and Himself. So it is that, though a poet-preacher, he is as well an interpreter of Christ and Scripture as these make the light to shine in darkness.

He has in mind as his auditor the saint rather than the sinner, and has less to tell than could be wished of the way into life, but he calls men to their better selves and to the unseen things which are eternal. The English is clear and limpid and the illustrations dignified and well chosen. The volume is welcomed as a contribution to devotional literature and to the preacher's library, which will bring fresh views of old truths and suggest visions of truth that one may count all his own.

**SHOES AND RATIONS FOR A LONG MARCH; OR, NEEDS AND SUPPLIES IN EVERYDAY LIFE.** By H. CLAY TRUMBULL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903. 8vo, pp. 353.

The death of Dr. Trumbull shortly after the appearance of this volume adds to the interest in it. The sermons contained in it furnish new evidence of his versatility as well as of his rare consecration of talent to Christian service. The introductory chapter and the prefatory notes to the several sermons supply interesting glimpses of the personality of the preacher and of his method. The sermons differ from the usual model not so much because "he never had the help or the hindrances of a theological seminary," as the author supposes, as because they have profited by a lifetime of revisions and accretions. He calls them "sermon-growths from an army chaplain's talks." Of one sermon he tells us that he took thirteen months for its preparation, and afterwards remade it several times. By this means the discourses have attained a roundedness of development and fullness of apt illustration beyond the reach of the pastor who must prepare two sermons a week. But there is here happy suggestion of the difficult art of using old material, keeping it fresh and improving it with repetition. The secret is largely in his finding his inspiration in his audience and their peculiar needs and situation. The successful effort to find the point of contact and enter into the life of his hearers secures freshness, vividness and variety. The sermons are instinct with life. While honoring text and Scripture, there is unusual variety of theme and treatment.

Princeton.

PAUL MARTIN.

## VII.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

**A HISTORY OF AMERICAN LITERATURE, 1607-1865.** By WILLIAM P. TRENT, M.A., LL.D., Professor of English Literature in Columbia University. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1903. 8vo; pp. vii, 608.

To quote the author's words in praise of Hawthorne's campaign life of Franklin Pierce, this is "a creditable and thoroughly honest piece of work." Indeed, we think it hardly excessive praise to pronounce the book brilliant; and we are tempted to predict that it will establish the position of the author

as a literary critic of the first class. He has breadth and firmness of grasp, fine analytical power, a judicial instead of partisan temper, acquaintance with the best elements of "English undefiled," a sense of humor, the gift of perspective and the ability to write racyly, tersely and entertainingly—in other words, the combination of qualities that is essential to the equipment of the good critic of English authorship. A single illustration out of many the book affords may serve to reveal the author's gift of nice discrimination—his summing up of the literary quality of Webster's speeches: "If his style is all that has been claimed . . . he is a great man of letters. . . . Is he not rather a fountain-head of American patriotism—a very different thing?" (p. 576). His lightness of touch may be illustrated by his reference to certain contributions of the poet Halleck to the *Evening Post*: "These squibs were known as 'The Croaker Papers' (1819), an unwarrantably lugubrious and curiously prophetic title" (p. 270). In short, Professor Trent is a virile and correct thinker, and he has offered the public a book that contains not a single dull or uninteresting page.

The author endeavors to guard against a criticism of the scope of his work by stating in his preface that he has adopted "a somewhat enlarged scale of treatment"; which means that he has planned to discuss elements of American authorship, particularly in connection with our Colonial and Revolutionary periods, that would be apt to be regarded as of insufficient importance to merit notice in a history of a literature as rich in materials of the first class as that produced, say, on English or French soil. But we are inclined to think, in spite of the deliberateness with which he has adopted his plan of treatment, that his method is slightly misleading. America contributed to classic English not a single volume that, according to accepted standards, is to be regarded as a masterpiece, prior to the advent of Washington Irving. As late as 1820 we merited the reproach of Sydney Smith—"In the four quarters of the globe, who reads an American book?" And, frankly, on any principle of selection it appears to us somewhat whimsical to treat Wigglesworth's *The Day of Doom*, or Franklin's Almanac, or Lindley Murray's Grammar, or even the Declaration of Independence, as literature. Not even the verses of Freneau clearly deserve that honor. Hence, the work is, in a measure, lacking in proportion, for 209 of its pages out of a total of 579 pages are devoted to what is viewed as the literature of "The Colonial Period," "The Revolutionary Period" and the transitional epoch of "The Formative Period"—which in the mass might be more accurately termed our *non-literature*. Either, then, this department of the book should have been briefer or the subsequent departments should have received fuller treatment. The foundation seems unduly large for its superstructure. It is but fair to say, however, that the initial chapters in question are very instructive and are charmingly written.

We know of no saner estimate that has been taken of Irving, Cooper, Hawthorne and Emerson than that presented in these pages. The critique of Emerson is particularly brilliant; and we find ourselves in accord with its conclusion that the Sage of Concord is not to be regarded as a philosopher, poet or man of letters of the very highest order, but that "among all Anglo-Saxons there appears to be no one that stands higher than he as an ethical inspirer or stimulator" (p. 336). Hawthorne, we agree, is to be regarded as having made on the whole the best contribution to our literature; and of course *The Scarlet Letter* stands at the summit of American classics. Probably the author's estimate of Poe is in the near vicinity of the final judgment of literary criticism upon that unhappy genius. Possibly our eyes have been holden, but we have not seen as many beauties in Whitman as Prof. Trent has, who, however, is far from being a Whitmanite. To us the author of *The Leaves of Grass* is essentially a pagan, with a

truly "barbaric yawp," and we are brutal enough to hope that he may be forgotten. And speaking of oblivion, it may be remarked that this book is a calling the roll of the dead as well as a sounding the praises of the undying. It reminds us anew of the uncertainty of literary fame; nay, of the certainty that a generation of a great people has but a few names at most of authors that are to be bequeathed to a subsequent century.

The book is carefully indexed, and it contains an admirable bibliography of thirteen pages.

Cranford, N. J.

GEORGE FRANCIS GREENE.

ESSAYS, VERSES AND TRANSLATIONS. By THOMAS CONRAD PORTER, D.D., LL.D. With Biographical Sketch. By SAMUEL A. MARTIN, Editor.

FLORA OF PENNSYLVANIA. By THOMAS CONRAD PORTER, D.D., LL.D. Late Professor of Botany in Lafayette College. Edited, with the Addition of Analytical Tables, by JOHN KUNKEL SMALL, Ph.D., Curator of the Museums and Herbarium of New York Botanical Garden. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1903.

Our lamented friend Prof. Porter was for more than a generation one of the best known of our men of Science, and was recognized in scientific circles as our best authority on the Botany of Pennsylvania, in which State he had served as Professor for nearly half a century, first in Marshall College and afterwards in Lafayette, where he was also the eminent Pastor of the Reformed Church of Easton. As fitting memorials of him the above-named books have been printed by his family. The *Flora* is also of public utility; for, thanks in part to the valuable editorial labor of Dr. Small, it has been supplied with all the recent improvements in Botany, and these are numerous and important: and hence it is our best manual of the native plants of the Keystone State. The biographical sketch, prepared with filial love by the Rev. President Martin, gives us a picture of a fine example of the Scotch-Irish-German stock of mid-Pennsylvania—a scholarly man, able as well as accomplished, versatile and not without fire. He passed through two crises, the Confederate struggle and the Darwinian struggle. The first of these separated him and his friend Joseph LeConte, who in war times served the South by manufacturing gunpowder, and afterwards spent the rest of his career as a Professor of Geology in California. LeConte was greatly interested in the Darwinian struggle, and bore a share with some other scientific men in adjusting our ideas on the subject. Porter's chief connection with the war seems to have been at its close when he wrote a war song entitled *The Rocky Hills of Gettysburg*, which became very popular with the soldiers. As to the scientific problems, President Martin informs us that "the great biological revolution did not entail on Dr. Porter the necessity of recasting his theology. His thorough familiarity with both realms (science and theology) made his judgment in all cases of supposed conflict between science and the Bible very valuable. . . . For more than twenty-five years he lectured to his students on Science and Religion, and in these lectures he discussed with the utmost freedom every question of the day pertaining to this field, and uttered his convictions with perfect frankness. His views were often very far in advance of those generally accepted by his Church at the time. Yet such was their confidence in his scholarship and good judgment that his orthodoxy was never called in question by his brethren." The biographer goes on to make the very true remark that whilst the Church is properly jealous of her faith, "she has been, in recent years at least, remarkably tolerant of all convictions of men whom she feels she can trust, whose knowledge and good sense are approved." To

this statement we may add that the well-known character of the Lafayette alumni, especially of the very large proportion of them who have devoted themselves to the Christian ministry, is the best evidence of the wholesome effect of this liberal policy in scientific matters.

*Princeton University.*

G. MACCLOSIE.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THOMAS JEFFERSON. By THOMAS E. WATSON.

When the venerable Dr. Cuyler introduced the late and lamented Dr. Purves at an alumni dinner of the Princeton Theological Seminary, he remarked that there was a place in Western Pennsylvania where all you had to do was to light a match and you get a blaze.

The word "blaze" that was applied to Dr. Purves would well suit the style of the author of this book, who has a fiery manner of expression which, no doubt, he acquired when he was a Populist Congressman from Georgia. He knows that most readers, especially those who read the *New York Journal*, for which the biography was originally written, hate long periodic sentences; and, therefore, like his master Carlyle and Cæsar's friend Sallust, he delights in short sentences.

This "voluminous" history contains fifty-one chapters, twelve illustrations and 534 pages with an index. We commend the publishers for the large type that was used. The day for the printing of books in small type is past. We have no doubt that one of the reasons McMaster's *History* is not read as much as it should be is because it is printed in such small type.

Mr. Watson believes that the reason why people dislike history is because the style of the historian is so dull. Those of us who have had the pleasure of reading Watson's *Napoleon* and his *Story of France* know that this is a charge which could not be maintained against the author, in spite of his conceit in thinking that he is the *only* historian worthy of the name, and that Woodrow Wilson, Henry Cabot Lodge and John Fiske are mere imitators of Gibbon, Macaulay, Grote and Green. We must confess that we have never read a history that we really enjoyed so much as the author's *Napoleon* and *Story of France*; and the press of other duties has not prevented our reading to the end of the volume under review, even to that wonderful climax of Jefferson's "Last Days and Death"; and we do not think that the author has sacrificed the facts of history in making his book read like the pages of a fascinating novel.

We cannot agree with Mr. Watson's preface in which he bewails because no "National" history of our country exists. On the contrary, we have always commended Dr. Wilson's *History of the American People*, because he treated all sections of our country with fairness. Living in New Jersey and not in "New England," as Mr. Watson writes, and being also a Southern gentleman of Southern parentage, Dr. Wilson was more competent to write a "National" history of the United States than any other of our historians.

The dullest reading in Mr. Watson's biography is his chapter on his native Georgia, and the one defect of his book is his criticisms and gibes against other great historians. Now if Mr. Watson does not like Woodrow Wilson's "stuff" and Henry Cabot Lodge's "dead tradition," let him write for us a truly "National" history of our country, treating fairly all sections of our country, *New England* as well as the West and South; and even though he publishes it first in the so-called "yellow journals," we will give it a hearty welcome, as we know that deep in Mr. Watson's heart he wishes to give us a history that is full of facts and with such a blaze of style that the jaded novel reader will lay aside his story for a class of reading that brings us near to the stars.

*Princeton.*

EDWIN W. RAND.



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01025 9176



